THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

PARL. PAPERS
OR REFERENCE ONLY.

616934

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION),

FOURTH SERIES

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT
OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

7 EDWARD VII.

VOLUME CLXXVIII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THURSDAY, ELEVENTH DAY OF JULY, 1907, TO WEDNESDAY, TWENTY-FOURTH DAY OF JULY, 1907.

TENTH VOLUME OF SESSION.

1907.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED,
UNDER CONTRACT WITH HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY
WYMAN AND SONS, LIMITED, FETTER LANE, LONDON.

847^2

CHRONOLOGY OF "THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES."

THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY contains all that can be collected of the Legislative History of this country from the Conquest to the close of the XVIIIth Century (1803), 36 vols. The chief sources whence these Debates are derived are the Constitutional History, 24 vols.; Sir Simonds D'Ewes' Journal; Debates of the Commons in 1620 and 1621; Chandler and Timberland's Debates, 22 vols.; Grey's Debates of the Commons, from 1667 to 1694, 10 vols.; Almon's Debates, 24 vols.; Debrett's Debates, 63 vols.; The Hardwicke Papers; Debates in Parliament by Dr. Johnson, &c., &c.

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES commence with the year 1803, and the contents are set forth in the following Chronological Table:—

HISTORY.

CONQUEST to 34 GEO. II.—1066 to 1760.

Vol. 1 to 15, 1 Will. I. to 34 Geo. II.
1066-1760

REIGN OF GEORGE III.—1760 to 1820.

Vol. 15 to 35, 1 Geo. III. to 40 Geo. III.
1760-1800

(First Parliament.)

Vol. 35	41	Geo. III.	1801
— 36	42	—	1802

(Second Parliament.)

Vol. 36	42	Geo. III.	1802-3

DEBATES.

First Series.

(Second Parliament—*continued.*)

Vol. 1 & 2	44	Geo. III.	1803-4
— 3 to 5	45	—	1805
— 6 & 7	46	—	1806

(Third Parliament.)

Vol. 8 & 9	47	Geo. III.	1806-7

(Fourth Parliament.)

Vol. 9 to 11	48	Geo. III.	1807-8
— 12 — 14	49	—	1809
— 15 — 17	50	—	1810
— 18 — 20	51	—	1810-11
— 21 — 23	52	—	1812

(Fifth Parliament.)

Vol. 24 to 26	53	Geo. III.	1812-13
— 27 & 28	54	—	1813-14
— 29 to 31	55	—	1814-15
— 32 — 34	56	—	1816
— 35 & 36	57	—	1817
— 37 — 38	58	—	1818

(Sixth Parliament.)

Vol. 39 & 40	59	Geo. III.	1819
— 41	60	—	1819-20

Second Series.

REIGN OF GEORGE IV.—1820 to 1830.

(Seventh Parliament.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1	Geo. IV.	1820
— 4 & 5	2	—	1821
— 6 — 7	3	—	1822
— 8 — 9	4	—	1823
— 10 — 11	5	—	1824
— 12 — 13	6	—	1825-6
— 14 — 15	7	—	1826

(Eighth Parliament.)

Vol. 16	7	Geo. IV.	1826
— 17	8	—	1827
— 18 & 19	9	—	1828
— 20 — 21	10	—	1829
— 22 to 25	11	—	1830

Third Series.

REIGN OF WILLIAM IV.—1830 to 1837.

(NINTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 1 to 3... 1 WILL. IV.......1830-1

(TENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 4 to 8... 2 WILL. IV. 1832
— 9 — 14... 3 — 1831

(ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 15 to 20... 4 WILL. IV....... 1833
— 21 — 25... 5 — 1834

(TWELFTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 26 to 30... 6 WILL. IV....... 1835
— 31 — 35... 7 — 1836
— 36 — 38... 8 — 1837

REIGN OF VICTORIA—1837 to 1901.

(THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 39 to 44... 1 VICTORIA 1838
— 45 — 50... 2 — 1839
— 51 — 55... 3 — 1840
— 56 — 58... 4 — (a) 1841

(FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 59 .... 4 VICTORIA (b) 1841
— 60 to 65... 5 — 1842
— 66 — 71 .. 6 — 1843
— 72 — 76... 7 — 1844
— 77 — 82.. 8 — 1845
— 83 — 88... 9 — 1846
— 89 — 94...10 — (a) 1847

(FIFTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 95 ... .10 VICTORIA (b) 1847
— 96 to 101...11 — 1848
— 102 —107...12 — 1849
— 108 —113...13 — 1850
— 114 —118...14 — 1851
— 119 —122...15 — (a) 1852

(SIXTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 123 ....15 VICTORIA (b) 1852
— 124 to 129...16 — 1853
— 130 —135...17 — 1854
— 136 —139...18 — 1855
— 140 —143...19 — 1856
— 144 ... .20 — (a) 1857

(SEVENTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 145 to 147...20 VICTORIA (b) 1857
— 148 —151 ..21 — 1858
— 152 —153...22 — (a) 1859

(EIGHTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 154 to 155...22 VICTORIA (b) 1859
— 156 —160...23 — 1860
— 161 —164...24 — 1861
— 165 —168...25 — 1862
— 169 —172...26 — 1863
— 173 —176...27 — 1864
— 177 —180...28 — 1865

(NINETEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 181 to 184...29 VICTORIA...... 1866
— 185 —189...30 — 1867
— 190 —193...31 — ... 1867-8

(TWENTIETH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 194 to 198...32 VICTORIA ... 1868-9
— 199 —203...33 — 1870
— 204 —208...34 — 1871
— 209 —213...35 — 1872
— 214 —217...36 — 1873

(TWENTY-FIRST PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 218 to 221...37 VICTORIA 1874
— 222 —226...38 — 1875
— 227 —231...39 — 1876
— 232 —236...40 — 1877
— 237 —242...41 — 1878
— 243 —249...42 — ... 1878-9
— 250 & 251...43 — (a) 1880

(TWENTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 252 to 256...43 VICTORIA (b) 1880
— 257 —265...44 — 1881
— 266 —273...45 — (a) 1882
— 274 & 275...45 — (b) 1882
— 276 to 283...46 — 1883
— 284 —292...47 — 1884
— 293 —301...48 — ... 1884-5

(TWENTY-THIRD PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 302 to 307...49 VICTORIA (a) 1886

(TWENTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 308 & 309...49 VICTORIA (b) 1886
— 310 to 321...50 — 1887
— 322 —332...51 — 1888
— 333 —340...52 — 1889
— 341 —348...53 — 1890
— 349 —356...54 — ... 1890-1

Fourth Series.

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament—*cont.*)

Vol.	1 to 6	55	Victoria	1892

(Twenty-Fifth Parliament.)

Vol.	7	56	Victoria	1892
—	8 to 21	57	—	1893-4
—	22 — 29	57	—	1894
—	30 — 35	58	—	1895

(Twenty-Sixth Parliament.)

Vol.	36	59	Victoria	1895
—	37 to 44	59	—	1895-6
—	45 — 52	60	—	1897
—	53 — 65	61	—	1898
—	66 — 76	62	—	1899
—	77	63	—	1899
—	78 — 83	63	—	1900
—	84	63 & 64	—	1900
—	85 — 87	64	—	1900

(Twenty-Seventh Parliament.)

Vol.	88	64	Victoria	1900

REIGN OF EDWARD VII.

(Twenty-Seventh Parliament—*cont.*)

Vol.	89	1	Edward VII.	1901
—	90 to 100	1	—	1901
—	101	1 & 2	—	1902
—	102 to 117	2	—	1902
—	118 to 128	3	—	1903
—	129 to 140	4	—	1904
—	141 to 151	5	—	1905

(Twenty-Eighth Parliament.)

Vol.	152 to 168	6	Edward VII.	1906
Vol.	169 to 178	7	,, ,,	1907

HIS MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE, ETC.

SIR HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN'S FIRST ADMINISTRATION

DECEMBER 1905.

THE CABINET.

Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury——Rt. Hon. Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN.
Lord President of the Council——Rt. Hon. the Earl of CREWE.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Lord LOREBURN.
Chancellor of the Exchequer——Rt. Hon. H. H. ASQUITH, M.P.
Secretaries of State——
    Home Department——Rt. Hon. HERBERT J. GLADSTONE, M.P.
    Foreign Affairs——Rt. Hon. Sir EDWARD GREY, Bt., M.P.
    Colonial Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of ELGIN.
    War Office——Rt. Hon. R. B. HALDANE, M.P.
    India Office——Rt. Hon. JOHN MORLEY, M.P.
First Lord of the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. LORD TWEEDMOUTH.
Chief Secretary for Ireland——Rt. Hon. A. BIRRELL, M.P.
Lord Privy Seal——Most. Hon. Marquess of RIPON.
President of the Board of Education——Rt. Hon. R. McKENNA, M.P.
President of the Board of Trade——Rt. Hon. D. LLOYD-GEORGE, M.P.
President of the Local Government Board——Rt. Hon. JOHN BURNS, M.P.
President of the Board of Agriculture——Rt. Hon. Earl CARRINGTON.
Postmaster-General——Rt. Hon. SYDNEY BUXTON, M.P.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——Rt. Hon. Sir HENRY FOWLER, M.P.
The Secretary for Scotland——Rt. Hon. J. SINCLAIR, M.P.
The First Commissioner of Works—Rt. Hon. L. HARCOURT, M.P.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Under Secretary of State, Foreign Office——Lord FITZMAURICE.
Under Secretary of State, Home Office——HERBERT SAMUEL, Esq., M.P.
Under Secretary of State, Colonial Office——Rt. Hon. WINSTON CHURCHILL, M.P.
Under Secretary of State, India Office——C. E. HOBHOUSE, Esq., M.P.
Under Secretary of State, War Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of PORTSMOUTH.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury——GEORGE WHITELEY, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education——THOMAS LOUGH, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. E. ROBERTSON, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade——H. E. KEARLEY, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board——DR. MACNAMARA, M.P.
Financial Secretary to the Treasury——WALTER RUNCIMAN, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the War Office——T. R. BUCHANAN, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Treasury——
    J. A. PEASE, Esq., M.P.
    HERBERT LEWIS, Esq., M.P.
    Captain CECIL NORTON, M.P.
    J. M. F. FULLER, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Admiralty——
    Admiral of the Fleet Sir JOHN FISHER.
    Vice-Admiral Sir C. C. DRURY.
    Rear-Admiral Sir H. B. JACKSON.
    Rear-Admiral F. S. INGLEFIELD.
Army Council——
    THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR [*in the Cabinet*].
    General Hon. Sir N. G. LYTTELTON (Chief of the General Staff).
    General C. W. H. DOUGLAS (Adjutant-General to the Forces).
    General Sir W. G. NICHOLSON (Quarter-Master-General to the Forces).
    Major-General Sir J. W. MURRAY (Master-General of the Ordnance).
    THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR.
    THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE.
    Secretary. THE PERMANENT UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Colonel Sir E. W. D. WARD).
The Civil Lord of the Admiralty——GEORGE LAMBERT, Esq., M.P.
Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland——Rt. Hon. the Earl of ABERDEEN.
Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland)——T. W. RUSSELL, Esq., M.P.
The Lord Advocate——THOMAS SHAW, Esq., M.P.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——In the Cabinet.
Attorney-General——Sir J. LAWSON WALTON, M.P.

OTHER OFFICERS OF STATE.

Solicitor-General——Sir W. S. ROBSON, M.P.
Paymaster-General——R. K. CAUSTON, Esq., M.P.
Lord Steward——Rt. Hon. Earl BEAUCHAMP.
Comptroller of the Household——The Master of ELIBANK, M.P.
Treasurer of the Household——Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Bt., M.P.
Lord Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Viscount ALTHORP.
Vice-Chamberlain——WENTWORTH BEAUMONT, Esq., M.P.
Master of the Horse——Rt. Hon. Earl of SEFTON.
Captain Yeoman of the Guard——His Grace the Duke of MANCHESTER.
Lords-in-Waiting——
  Earl GRANVILLE.
  Earl of GRANARD.
  Lord HAMILTON of DALZELL.
  Lord ACTON.
  Lord COLEBROOKE.
  Lord SUFFIELD.
  Lord HERSCHELL.
  Lord FARQUHAR.
Judge Advocate-General——T. MILVAIN, Esq., K.C.

SCOTLAND.

Secretary for Scotland and Keeper of the Great Seal——Rt. Hon. JOHN SINCLAIR.
Lord High Constable——Earl of ERROL.
Lord Privy Seal——Marquess of BREADELBANE, K.G.
Master of the Household——Duke of ARGYLL, K.T.
Lord High Commissioner——Lord KINNAIRD.
Lord Clerk Register——His Grace the Duke of MONTROSE, K.T.
Lord Justice General——Rt. Hon. Lord DUNEDIN.
Lord Advocate——Rt. Hon. THOMAS SHAW, K.C.
Lord Justice Clerk——Rt. Hon. Lord KINSBURGH, C.B.
Solicitor-General——ALEXANDER URE, Esq., K.C.
Register General and Deputy Keeper Great Seal—Sir STAIR AGNEW, K.C.B.
Commanding Forces——Lt.-Gen. E. P. LEACH, C.B., C.V.O.

IRELAND.

Lord-Lieutenant——Earl of ABERDEEN, G.C.M.G.
Chief Secretary and Keeper of Privy Seal——Rt. Hon. A. BIRRELL, M.P.
Under Secretary——Rt. Hon. Sir A. MACDONNELL, G.C.S.I., K.C.V.O.
Private Secretaries——Lord HERSCHELL and WALTER CALLAN, Esq.
State Steward and Chamberlain——The Earl of LIVERPOOL.
Controller——Major LAMBART.
Lord Chancellor——Lord Justice WALKER.
Attorney-General——Rt. Hon. R. R. CHERRY, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——REDMOND BARRY, Esq., K.C., M.P.
Commanding the Forces——Gen. Lord GRENFELL, G.C.B., G.C.M.G.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Chairman of Committees——Rt. Hon. Earl of Onslow.
Clerk of Parliaments——Sir Henry J. L. Graham, K.C.B.
Deputy Clerk of Parliaments (Clerk Assistant)——Hon. E. P. Thesiger, C.B.
Reading-Clerk and Clerk of Outdoor Committees——Edward Hall Alderson, Esq.
Counsel to the Chairman of Committees——Albert Gray, Esq.
Chief Clerk and Clerk of Public Bills——A. Harrison, Esq.
Senior Clerks——
  Clerk of the Journals——W. A. Leigh, Esq.
  Principal Clerk of Private Committees——J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.
  Principal Clerk, Judicial Department, and Taxing Officer of Judicial Costs——J. F. Skene, Esq.
  W. H. Hamilton Gordon, Esq.
  Peers' Printed Paper Office——C. L. Anstruther, Esq.
Other Clerks——Hon. A. McDonnell; A. H. Robinson, Esq. (Clerk of Private Bills and Taxing Officer of Private Bill Costs); H. P. St. John, Esq.; V. M. Biddulph, Esq.; Hon. E. A. Stonor; H. J. F. Badeley, Esq.; C. Headlam, Esq.; J. B. Hotham, Esq.; E. C. Vigors, Esq.; A. Tennyson, Esq.; G. D. Luard, Esq.; and G. Proby, Esq.
Receiver of Fees and Accountant——T. A. Court, Esq.
Copyists——Mr. H. P. Norris and Mr. R. A. Court.
Messengers——Messrs. A. A. Worfell, C. E. Chizlett, J. W. F Locke, J. McMillan, G. Bennett, G. T. Philip, W. S. Wright.
Librarian——Edmund Gosse, Esq., LL.D.
Assistant Librarian——A. H. M. Butler, Esq.
Attendant——Mr. A. N. Stott.
Examiners for Standing Orders——C. W. Campion, Esq.; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.; Clerk——H. C. Bramwell, Esq.
Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod——Admiral Sir F. H. Stephenson, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Yeoman Usher——Captain T. D. Butler, M.V.O.
Serjeant-at-Arms——Lt.-Col. Rt. Hon. Sir Fleetwood I. Edwards, G.C.V.O., K.C B.
Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms——S. Hand, Esq.
Resident Superintendent——J. K. Williams, Esq.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Principal Doorkeepers——Messrs. W. Chandler, E. Fox, F. Holman.
First Class Assistants——Messrs. C. Walker, J. Hedley, J. Lane, B. Gallop.
Second Class Assistants——Messrs. H. B. Strevens, G. W. Cross, W. Stopp.
Third Class Assistants——Messrs. J. Woolacott, A. A. Edney, J. F. Baum.
Messengers——Messrs. A. J. Solman, C. Chapman, W. Phillips, W. W. Meates, T. Whitehead.
Superintendent of Refreshment Rooms——Mr. W. Casbon.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Lords——Mr. A. Palmer.
Clerk of the Works, Houses of Parliament——Mr. P. E. Ridge.
Resident Engineer, Houses of Parliament——Mr. W. Bradshaw.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Clerk of the House of Commons——Sir Courtenay Peregrine Ilbert, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.
Clerk-Assistant——Arthur W. Nicholson, Esq.
Second Clerk-Assistant——T. L. Webster, Esq.
Principal Clerks——
  Public Bill Office, and Clerk of Fees——W. Gibbons, Esq., C.B.
  Clerk of the Journals——W. H. Ley, Esq.
  Committee Office——F. St. George Tupper, Esq.
  Private Bill Office——J. H. W. Somerset, Esq.
Senior Clerks——C. V. Frere, Esq.; G. C. Giffard, Esq.; Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart.; S. L. Simeon, Esq.; Arthur I. Dasent, Esq.; Horace West, Esq.
Assistant Clerks——Henry A. Ferguson-Davie, Esq.; Arthur H. Ellis, Esq.; Percy A. Bull, Esq.; F. R. Williams Wynn, Esq.; W. E. Grey, Esq.; F. C. Holland, Esq.; J. W. G. Bond, Esq.; H. C. Dawkins, Esq.; R. P. Colomb, Esq.; B. H. Fell, Esq.; R. E. Childers, Esq.; J. Scott Porter, Esq.
Junior Clerks——F. C. Bramwell, Esq.; W. T. Legge, Esq.; C. R. Turner, Esq.; W. K. Gibbons, Esq.; W. P. Johnston, Esq.; J. Barlow, Esq.; Hon. H. R. C. Balfour; R. N. Bailey, Esq.; G. F. M. Campion, Esq.; S. De la Poer Beresford, Esq.; H. S. Green, Esq.

Serjeant-at-Arms——H. D. ERSKINE, Esq., C.V.O.
Deputy Serjeant——F. R. GOSSET, Esq.
Assistant Serjeant——W. H. ERSKINE, Esq.
Office Messenger——Mr. C. J. H. SHEARN.
Chaplain to the House——The Ven. Archdeacon BASIL WILBERFORCE, D.D.
Secretary to the Speaker——Hon. EDWARD GULLY, C.B.
Counsel to the Speaker——Hon. Sir E. CHANDOS LEIGH, K.C., K.C.B
Trainbearer——Mr. W. MURRELL.
Messenger——Mr. W. HOLT.
Collector of Fees on Private Bills——C. L. LOCKTON, Esq.
Clerk to Referees——Sir E. H. DOYLE, Bart.
Examiners of Private Bills——C. W. CAMPION, Esq. ; J. F. SYMONS JEUNE Esq
Taxing Master——C. W. CAMPION, Esq. ; Clerk——F. C. BRAMWELL, Esq.
Vote Office——
  Principal Clerk——PHILIP SMITH, Esq.
  Assistant Clerks——JOHN POYSER, Esq. ; W. K. SANDERSON, Esq.
  Messenger——Mr. JOHN EDWARDS.
Librarian——R. C. WALPOLE, Esq. ; Assistant Librarian——A. E. A. W. SMYTH, Esq. Clerks in Library——Messrs. J. R. CRIMP, WM. STEWART : Messengers——Messrs. A. FIRMIN, W. HAGUE.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. GURNEY SALTER, Esq.
Printers——
  Journals——G. E. BRISCOE EYRE, Esq.
  Votes——J. B. NICHOLS, Esq. (for H. M. Stationery Office.)
Postmaster——Mr. I. LINCOLN ; Hall Keeper——Mr. J. GLYNN.
Office Keeper——Mr. H. BULLOCK.
Office Clerk in Committee Office——Mr. T. FIELDEN MITCHELL.
Office Clerk in Journal Office——Mr. A. A. TAYLOR.
Messengers——Messrs. C. DAVIE, H. JONES, G. D. WELLER, J. ARMSTRONG, J. WOODWARD, J. IVORY, G. NORMAN, J. SURREY, A. SEPPLE.
Doorkeepers——Mr. M. INGLEFIELD and Mr. H. HAMBLING.
Messengers (1st Class)——Mr. C. WOODCRAFT, Mr. R. ROBERTSON, Mr. J. HILLS, Mr. J. SPRAGUE, Mr. A. ANDREWS, Mr. T. B. SPRAY, Mr. G. ANSTEY, Mr. J. H. DAY, Mr. J. HENDERSON, Mr. G. WAINWRIGHT, Mr. J. GUYATT.
Messengers (2nd Class)——Messrs. R. TURTLE, A. HASKELL, A. C. JOHNSON, G. CLAPPERTON, H. E. LININGTON, H. G. EMMETT, J. L. PHILIP, W. FINDLAY, W. MACDONALD, W. R. BRIMSON.
Superintendent of Members' Waiting Room——Mr. J. F. HENLEY ; Assistant——Mr. W. BROADBENT ; Porters——Messrs. J. HART and G. FRY.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Commons——Mr. SCANTLEBURY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CLXXVIII.

TENTH VOLUME OF SESSION, 1907.

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 11TH JULY, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Page

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3). Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13).

The same were ordered to lie upon the Table 1

London United Tramways Bill.—Read 3^{a}, and passed 1

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; (Fleetwood Victoria Pier Order). Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 1

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.] 2

Amendments reported (according to order); and Bills to be read 3^{a} on Monday next .. ..

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Indian (Textile Factories).—Report of the Textile Factories Labour Committee, appointed by the Government of India, December, 1906, to inquire into the conditions of factory labour in India; with Appendices 2

Trade Reports: Annual Series.

No. 3856. United States (Philadelphia).. 2

Judicial Statistics (Ireland), 1906.—Part II. Civil Statistics 2

July 11.] Page

OLD-AGE PENSIONS.—Tables which have been prepared in connection with the question of old-age pensions, with a preliminary memorandum.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 3

NEW BILLS.

Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to Order).

[The Earl of ONSLOW in the Chair.]

Clause 1 :—

Lord Monk Bretton .. ..

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 6, to leave out the words 'a councillor or,' and to insert the word 'an.'"—(*Lord Monk Bretton.*)

The Lord President of the Council (The Earl of Crewe) 6
The Marquess of Lansdowne 8
The Earl of Malmesbury 10
Lord James of Hereford 11
The Earl of Jersey 12
Earl Russell 14
The Duke of Northumberland 14
The Earl of Crewe 16

On Question, whether the words "a councillor or" should stand part of the clause.

Their Lordships divided :—Contents, 73 ; Not-Contents, 46.

The Earl of Camperdown 17

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 8, to leave out the word 'if,' and to insert the words 'shall not be.'"—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

The Earl of Crewe 18
Viscount St. Aldwyn 19
Lord Courtney of Penwith 20
The Earl of Camperdown 21
The Earl of Crewe 21

On Question, whether the word "if" should stand part of the clause.

Their Lordships divided :—Contents, 49 ; Not-Contents, 61.

On Question, the proposed words "shall not be elected" were there inserted.

The Earl of Camperdown 23

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 8, to leave out from the word 'borough' to the end of the subsection."—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Bill reported to the House.

Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Tuesday next; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 109.)

Advertisements Regulation Bill.—House in Committee (according to Order).

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2:—

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 23

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 9, after the word 'advertising' to insert the words 'when they exceed twelve feet in height.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

Lord Belper 24
Earl Beauchamp 24
Lord Balfour of Burleigh 24

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 25

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 9, to leave out the word 'two,' and insert the word 'five.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 26

Amendment moved—

"To insert as a new sub-section: 'The expression 'pleasure promenade' shall not include any road or street mainly used for business purposes.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

Viscount St. Aldwyn 26
Earl Beauchamp 27
Lord Balfour of Burleigh 27
The Earl of Halsbury 27

July 11.] *Page*

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Lord Avebury 28
Lord Balfour of Burleigh 28
Lord Belper 28

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3, agreed to.

Lord Killanin 29

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 3, to insert the following new clause, 'In the application of this Act to the administrative county of London, outside the City of London, it shall be the duty of every metropolitan borough council within its own area to enforce the by-laws made under this Act, and any expenses incurred by a metropolitan borough council shall be defrayed as part of the expenses of that council.'"—(*Lord Killanin.*)

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 29
Earl Beauchamp 30

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 4 agreed to.

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 31

Amendment moved—

"To insert the following new clause: 'The powers and provisions of this Act shall be deemed to be in addition to and not in derogation of any other powers or provisions of any local Act of Parliament, and the powers and provisions of any such local Act may be exercised and enforced in the same manner as if this Act had not been passed.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 5 agreed to.

Clause 6:—

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 15, after the first 'the' to insert the word 'administrative.'"—(*Lord Killanin.*)

Earl Beauchamp 31
Lord Balfour of Burleigh 32

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Lord Denman 32

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 17, to leave out the words 'or Ireland.'"—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 6, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 7 :—

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 31, after the word 'State' to insert the words the 'Public Health (Ireland) Acts 1878 to 1900,' shall be substituted for the Public Health Acts, and any references to a borough shall not have effect.'"—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill recommitted to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended. [No. 110.]

Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill [H.L.].—Read 3^a (according to Order); Drafting Amendments made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons 32

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Seven o'clock, to Monday next, half-past Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 11TH JULY, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Kendal Corporation Bill [LORDS]; Wisbech Water Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 33

Devenport Corporation Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; A clause added; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 33

Tees Valley Water (Consolidation) Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 33

Tees Conservancy Bill [LORDS] (BY ORDER).—Order for consideration, as amended, read, and discharged—Bill recommitted to the former Committee in respect of the provisions relating to the superannuation fund 33

Ordered, That the Committee have leave to sit and proceed forthwith.—(*The Deputy Chairman*) 33

Dundee Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 33

July 11.] Page

Portobello and Musselburgh Tramways (Levenhall Extension) Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time; to be considered upon Monday next 33

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP J).—Major SEELY reported from the Committee on Group J of Private Bills; That the parties opposing the Renfrewshire Upper District (Eastwood and Mearns) Water Bill had stated that the evidence of William H. Hill, of 194, Ingram Street, Glasgow, was essential to their case; and, it having been proved that his attendance could not be procured without the intervention of the House, he had been instructed to move that the said William H. Hill do attend the said Committee To-morrow and on Monday 15th July, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Ordered, That William H. Hill do attend the Committee on Group J of Private Bills To-morrow and on Monday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock 33

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No.1) Bill [LORDS].—Reported without Amendment. [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow 34

Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill [LORDS]; Oxford and District Tramways Bill [Lords]; Tees Conservancy (re-committed) Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 34

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP J).—Major SEELY reported from the Committee on Group J of Private Bills; That Mr. Strauss, one of the members of the said Committee, was not present during the sitting of the Committee this day.

Report to lie upon the Table 34

Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Water Bill [LORDS].—Report [9th July] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill to be read a second time.—(*The Deputy Chairman.*) 34

PETITIONS.

MOTOR TRAFFIC (PROTECTION OF CHILDREN, CATTLE, AND CROPS.)—Petition from Preston Patrick, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 34

SMALL LANDHOLDERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Fife, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 34

WEEKLY REST-DAY BILL.—Petitions in favour, from Harlesden and other places; and, Peckham and other places; to lie upon the Table 34

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CRIMINAL AND JUDICIAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Criminal and Judicial Statistics of Ireland for the year 1906. Part II. Civil Statistics [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 35

July 11.] *Page*

EAST INDIA (TEXTILE FACTORIES).—Copy presented, of Report of the Textile Factories Labour Committee appointed by the Government of India, December, 1906, to inquire into the conditions of Factory Labour in India, with Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 35

OLD-AGE PENSIONS.—Copy presented, of Tables which have been prepared in connection with the question of Old-age Pensions [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 35

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No. 3856 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 35

PUBLIC INCOME AND EXPENDITURE.—Return ordered, "of net Public Income and net Public Expenditure under certain specified heads as represented by receipts into and issues out of the Exchequer from 1892–3 to 1905–7, inclusive (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 266, of session 1906)."—(*Sir Henry Fowler*) 35

APPOINTMENT OF JUSTICES (FEES).—Address for "Return of Fees payable on appointment by Justices of the Peace in England and Wales."—(*Mr. Herbert Samuel*) 35

HIGHER EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES.)—Return ordered, "showing the expenditure to which, and the manner in which, local authorities in England and in Wales have applied funds for the purposes of Education other than elementary during the year 1906–7 under any of the following Acts: Education Act, 1902; Welsh Intermediate Education Act, 1889; Public Libraries and Museums Acts; Local or Private Acts."—(*Mr. McKenna*) 35

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

FACILITIES FOR YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS BILL.—Question, Mr. Wedgwood (Newcastle-under-Lyme; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 36

YOUNG PERSONS AND INTOXICANTS.—Question, Mr. Wedgwood; Answer, Mr. McKenna 36

ACCOMMODATION FOR THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE.—Question, Mr. Lane Fox (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash); Answer, Mr. Harcourt 37

SALE OF ESTATE OF CAPTAIN MAGAN IN COUNTY KILDARE.—Question, Mr. John O'Connor (Kildare, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 37

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

H.M.S. "CUMBERLAND."—Question, Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, (Dundee).. .. 37

H.M.S. "EDWARD VII."—Question, Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 38

NAVAL SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMME.—Question, Mr. Hunt; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 38

H.M.S. "INDEFATIGABLE."—Questions, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.), Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.), Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answers, Mr. Edmund Robertson 38

July 11.]

Page

SHIPS' ARMAMENTS.—Question, Mr. Courthope; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 39

H.M.S. "RENOWN."—Questions, Mr. Gretton (Rutland), Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley; Answers, Mr. Edmund Robertson 40

H.M.S. "BLAKE" AND H.M.S. "BLENHEIM."—Question, Mr. Gretton; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 40

THE MILITIA AND THE SPECIAL RESERVE.—Question, Mr. Courthope; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Office, (Mr. Buchanan, Perthshire, E.) 41

MILITIA OFFICERS AND THE WAR OFFICE COMMITTEE.—Question, Mr. Courthope; Answer, Mr. Buchanan 41

PLAGUE IN INDIA.—Question, Dr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) 42

INDIAN RAILWAYS.—Question, Sir Edward Sassoon (Hythe); Answer, Mr. Morley 42

JOHANNESBURG TRAMWAYS.—Question, Dr. Rutherford; Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) .. 43

WESTERN AUSTRALIA—TREATMENT OF NATIVES.—Question, Mr. Alden (Middlesex, Tottenham); Answer, Mr. Churchill 43

LABOUR INSPECTION IN THE NEW HEBRIDES.—Question, Mr. Staveley Hill (Staffordshire, Kingswinford); Answer, Mr. Churchill.. 44

DEATHS FROM PLAGUE IN EGYPT.—Question, Dr. Rutherford; Answer, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) 44

OUTRAGES IN MACEDONIA.—Questions, Dr. Rutherford, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answers, Sir E. Grey 44

NEWFOUNDLAND FISHERIES.—Questions, Mr. Hart Davies (Hackney, N.), Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool); Answers, Sir Edward Grey.. 45

GREAT BRITAIN, RUSSIA, AND PERSIA.—Questions, Mr. Lynch (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon), Mr. Rees; Answers, Sir E. Grey, Mr. Speaker 45

THE HAGUE CONFERENCE.—Questions, Mr. Alden, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester); Answers, Sir E. Grey 46

BRISTOL PILOTAGE DUES.—Question, Mr. W. Hope (Somersetshire, N.); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 47

TELEPHONIC AND TELEGRAPHIC RATES IN FRANCE.—Question, Sir Edward Sassoon; Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 48

AVERAGE SCHOOL ATTENDANCE UNDER FIFTY.—Question, Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.); Answer, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) 48

July 11.]

Page

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS BILL.—Question, Mr. John Redmond (Waterford); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) 48

SUGAR SURTAX.—Question, Sir Edward Sassoon; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 49

THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, The Treasurer of the Household (Sir Edward Strachey, Somersetshire, S.) .. 49

TIMBER IN IRELAND.—Questions, Mr. Cullinan (Tipperary, S.), Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.), Captain Donelan (Cork, E.); Answers, The Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland (Mr. T.W. Russell, Tyrone, S.) 49

HOLYWOOD DISTRICT COUNCIL'S CLERK.—Question, Mr. Kilbride; Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool Exchange, for Mr. Birrell) 50

IRISH DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Cherry 53

BOYCOTTING IN LEITRIM.—Question, Colonel Lockwood (Essex, Epping); Answer, Mr. Cherry 54

TULLAROAN EVICTED TENANT.—Question, Mr. Meagher (Kilkenny, N.); Answer, Mr. Cherry 53

URLINGFORD EVICTED TENANT.—Question, Mr. Meagher; Answer, Mr. Cherry 55

LABOURERS' COTTAGE SCHEMES.—Question, Mr. Sheehan (Cork County, Mid); Answer, Mr. Cherry 55

GRANGE SHOOTING OUTRAGE.—Question, Colonel Lockwood; Answer, Mr. Cherry 56

THE MEMBER FOR NORTH MAYO AND THE CRANNAGH FARM.—Questions, Colonel Lockwood, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cherry .. 56

ABBEYLEIX UNLAWFUL ASSEMBLY PROSECUTION.—Questions, Colonel Lockwood, Mr. Swift MacNeill, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answers, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Birrell 57

KERRY FAIR RENT COURTS.—Question, Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answer, Mr. Cherry 58

THE "FOREST HALL."—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. 58

SWINE FEVER AT CARLOW.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Sir E. Strachey .. 59

PARLIAMENT AND EGYPT.—Questions, Dr. Rutherford, Mr. Rees; Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 59

SIR JAMES BROWN SMITH.—Questions, Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.), Mr. Belloc (Salford, S.), Mr. Austen Chamberlain (Worcestershire, E.), Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Speaker 60

RADIOTELEGRAPH CONVENTION.—Questions, Sir Edward Sassoon, Sir Gilbert Parker, Mr. Gwynn (Galway); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. 61

July 11.] Page

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the second word 'the,' in page 37, line 7, stand part of the Vill."

Mr. Yoxall 132
Mr. Cleland (Glasgow, Bridgeton) 135
Sir Henry Craik (Glasgow and Aberdeen University) 136
Mr. Radford (Islington, E.) 137
Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 138
Mr. Layland Barrett 139

Question put, and agreed to.

Lord R. Cecil 139

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 37, line 7, after the word 'of,' to insert the words 'or employed in institutions maintained by.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Cleland 140

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill to be read the third time.

SUPPLY (CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES).

Postponed Proceeding on Motion made on consideration of Question, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,593,646, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the salaries and expenses of the Board of Education, and of the various Establishments connected therewith, including Grants for the Building of new Public Elementary Schools and sundry Grants in Aid :— "

Which Motion was, "That Item A (1) (Salaries, Wages, and Allowances) be reduced by £100. "—(*Mr. Boland*)—resumed.

Mr. Yoxall 140
Mr. Snowden (Blackburn) 143
T. P. O'Connor (Liverpool, Scotland) 146
Lord R. Cecil 149
Mr. McKenna 153

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 97 ; Noes, 220. (Division List, No. 276.)

Original Question again proposed.

And, it being after Eleven of the clock, and objection being taken to further Proceeding, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again upon Monday next.

Finance Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Mr. Hicks Beach (*Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury*) 158

New clause—

> " In addition to the deductions of one-eighth and one-sixth allowed under Section 35 of the Finance Act of 1894, there shall also, for the purposes of collection, be allowed the cost of insurance and a deduction for expenses of management not exceeding five per centum of the gross annual value."—(*Mr. Hicks Beach.*)

Brought up and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the clause be read a second time."

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (*Mr. Asquith, Fife, E.*) 161
Mr. Austen Chamberlain (*Worcestershire, E.*) 162
Mr. Lane-Fox (*Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash*) 163
Mr. Bridgeman (*Shropshire, Oswestry*) 163
Lord Willoughby de Eresby (*Lancashire, Horncastle*) 165
Mr. Asquith 167
Mr. Laurence Hardy (*Kent, Ashford*) 167
Mr. Hicks Beach 168

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 50 ; Noes, 192. (Division List No. 277.)

Colonel-Kenyon Slaney 171

New clause—

> " In calculating the duty to be paid on any estate, in regard to which reliable accounts are produced, the allowance for maintenance shall be the amount which such accounts show to have been the average annual expenditure for maintenance for the last ten years."—(*Colonel Kenyon-Slaney.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the clause be read a second time."

Colonel Kenyon Slaney 174

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Fell (*Great Yarmouth*) 174

July 11.] Page

New clause—

"Every company or corporation which is chargeable with income-tax on its profits shall be assessed only in respect of such profits as are distributed among the shareholders of that company or corporation."—(*Mr. Fell.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Asquith 176
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 177

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Samuel Roberts 177

New clause—

"On and after the first day of January, nineteen hundred and eight, the duty of Customs of one penny the pound on cocoa shall cease to be payable, and so much of The Customs Tariff Act, 1876, as refers to this duty is hereby repealed."—(*Mr. Samuel Roberts.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Asquith 179
Mr. Hunt (*Shropshire, Ludlow*) 180

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 36 ; Noes, 170. (Division List No. 278.)

Mr. H. H. Marks (*Kent, Thanet*) 183

New clause—

"(1) It shall be lawful for any employer within the meaning of The Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906, in estimating the amount at which he is chargeable for income-tax, to deduct therefrom any payments made by him during the year preceding the year in respect of which he is assessed—(*a*) by way of compensation to any person under The Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906 ; or (*b*) by way of premium in respect of any policy of insurance against liability under the said Act ; or (*c*) by way of contribution to any scheme of compensation benefit or insurance duly certified by the Registrar of Friendly Societies under the said Act. (2) In making payment to any person of any money payable to him as compensation under The Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906, the payer shall not deduct income-tax."—(*Mr. H. H. Marks.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

July 11.] *Page*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Asquith 185
Mr. Claude Hay (*Shoreditch, Hoxton*) 185

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir A. Spicer (*Hackney, Central*) 185

New clause—

"Nothing in the Income-tax Acts or the schedules thereto contained shall restrain any clergyman or minister of religion who shall rent a dwelling house, a part whereof shall be used by him mainly and substantially for the purposes of any profession or office, by the said Acts or schedules charged, from deducting or setting off from the stipend, salary, emoluments, fees, or profits of his profession or office, such sums not exceeding one-eighth part of the rent *bona fide* paid for such dwelling house, with the appurtenances, as the Commissioners shall on due consideration allow, and the Commissioners shall have authority to allow such deductions as in other cases, and to assess such persons accordingly.' "—(*Sir A. Spicer.*)

Brought up, and read a first and second time, and added to the Bill.

Mr. Claude Hay 186

New clause—

"It shall be lawful for any person, in estimating the amount of which he is chargeable for income-tax, to deduct therefrom any sums received by him during the year preceding the year in respect of which he is assessed (*a*) as compensation under the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906, for any injury to himself or to any person to whom he was dependent within the meaning of the Act; or (*b*) arising out of the investment or application of any sum paid or awarded to him as compensation under the said Act."—(*Mr. Claude Hay.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Claude Hay 187

New clause—

"The stamp duty upon a policy of sea insurance for or upon any voyage shall be one penny."—(*Mr. Claude Hay.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

July 11.]

Page

Mr. Asquith .. 187
Mr. Claude Hay .. 188

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

New clause—

> " Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in Section 10 of the Revenue Act, 1883, and subject to the conditions there set forth, gold and silver plate imported into Great Britain or Ireland may be delivered into the hands of the officers of any assay office selected by the importer though it be not the assay office nearest to the port of importance, and may, upon security being given to the satisfaction of the Commissioners of Customs, be removed to the assay office without being in charge of an officer of Customs."—(*Mr. Austen Chamberlain*).

Brought up, and read a first and second time, and added to the Bill.

Mr. H. H. Marks .. 188

New clause—

> " The stamp duty of any policy of insurance, or indemnity against liability incurred by employers in consequence of claims, or possible claims, upon them by workmen who have sustained personal injury, where the premium paid does not exceed two pounds, shall be one penny."—(*Mr. H. H. Marks.*)

Brought up, and read a first and second time, and added to the Bill.

Mr. Fell .. 189
Mr. Bridgeman .. 189

New clause—

> " It shall be lawful for any persons owning land and hereditaments to elect to be assessed to the duties of income-tax, chargeable under Schedule D, and in accordance with the rules of that Schedule, in lieu of assessment to the duties under Schedule A. The election of such person shall be signified by notice in writing delivered personally or sent by post in a registered letter to the surveyor of taxes for the district within two calendar months after the commencement of the year of assessment ; and from and after the receipt of such notice the charge upon him to the duties of income-tax for such year shall be under Schedule D, and the profits and gains arising to him from the ownership of the lands shall for all purposes be deemed to be profits or gains of a trade chargeable under that schedule."—(*Mr. Bridgeman.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the clause be read a second time."

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Rawlinson .. 190

July 11.] *Page*

New clause—

"Incomes of husband and wife shall be added together and divided by two for the purpose of ascertaining the exemption from or abatement of income-tax to which they are respectively entitled."—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Asquith 190

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Bill reported.

Bill re-committed in respect of an Amendment to Clause 16.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Financial (Re-Committed) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 13, at the end, to insert the words 'Provided that if in any year owing to any alteration in the rate of duties the rate of any such duty is higher than the rate in force at the commencement of this Act, and the proceeds of that duty in that year as so calculated are less than the average proceeds of the duty for the three years ending the thirty-first day of March, nineteen hundred and seven, the proceeds of the duty instead of being calculated as aforesaid shall be deemed to be the amount of those average proceeds, and the Commissioners of Inland Revenue shall give their certificates as to the sums ascertained to be the proceeds of those duties accordingly.' "—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Motion made, and Question, "That those words be there inserted,"—put, and agreed to.

Bill reported.

As amended in Committee, and on re-committal, to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 275.]

Lights on Vehicles Bill.—As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

Amendments proposed, and agreed to without discussion—

"In page 2, line 3, after the word 'pounds' to add the words 'Provided that no person charged with an offence under this Act shall be convicted thereof if he proves to the satisfaction of the Court that such offence arose through the neglect or default of some other person whose duty it was to provide such a lamp as is mentioned in the foregoing sub-sections.' "—(*Mr. Gill.*)

" In page 2, line 24, at the end to add the words ' (5) The Mersey Docks and Harbour Board shall as respects the area under their control have the same power to make an order of exemption under this section as the council of a borough have as respects their borough, and the powers of the council of a borough under this section shall not extend to any part of the borough which is situated within that area. In the application of this section to the area under the control of the Board, the Board shall be substituted for the council of the borough and the funds at the disposal of the Board for the borough fund or rate.' "—(*Mr. Austin Taylor.*)

" In page 2, line 34, to leave out the words ' or wagon drawn by the locomotive.' "—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

" In page 2, line 37, after ' 1898,' to insert the words ' or wagon drawn by that locomotive.' "—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

" In page 2, line 38, at the end to insert the words ' (*e*) any vehicle carrying farm produce to stack or barn during the months of August, September, and October.' "—(*Major Renton.*)

" In page 3, line 4, after the word ' thereunder,' to insert the words ' by a local authority ' ; line 5, after the first word ' shall,' to insert the words ' so far as respects vehicles to which this Act applies ' ; line 8, at the end, to insert the words ' (4) this Act shall apply to vehicles in the public service of the Crown, subject to any exceptions which His Majesty may make by Order in Council in the interests of the naval or military service of the Crown, and in the case of any such vehicle the person whom the Department in whose service the vehicle is used names as the person actually responsible shall be deemed for the purposes of this Act to be the person who causes or permits the vehicle to be in any street, highway or road.' "- -(*Mr. Runciman.*)

" In page 3, line 9, to leave out sub-section (4)."—(*Mr. Watt.*)

Bill read the third time, and passed 190

And, it being after half-past Eleven of the clock, on Thursday evening, Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 12TH JULY, 1907.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH.)—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That in the case of the following Bill originating in the Lords and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, *viz.* :—City of London (Union of Parishes) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 193

Great Northern and City Railway Bill.—Lords' Amendment considered, and agreed to 193

Great Central Railway Bill; RAWTENSTALL CORPORATION BILL.—Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to 193

Pontypridd Urban District Council Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendments 193

United Methodist Church Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 193

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 193

PETITIONS.

NEWFOUNDLAND FISHERIES.—Petition from Birmingham, for inquiry; to lie upon the Table 193

VIVISECTION (PROHIBITION).—Petition from Manchester and other places, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 193

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION (IMPERIAL COLLEGE CHARTER).—Copy presented, of the Charter of Incorporation of the Imperial College of Science and Technology [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 194

COMPANIES (WINDING-UP).—Copy presented, of Sixteenth General Annual Report by the Board of Trade [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 248] 194

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

BELFAST HARBOUR TRUST.—Questions, Mr. Devlin (Belfast, W.); Answers, Mr. Lloyd-George 195

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS—APPLICATION OF JAMES MEADE OF ARDEE.—Question, Mr. Patrick White (Meath, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 195

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS—APPLICATION OF MICHAEL TIERNAN OF WOODMILL.—Question, Mr. Patrick White; Answer, Mr. Birrell 196

ANGLO-PORTUGUESE CONVENTION OF 1890.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 196

July 12.] *Page*

SUPERANNUATION OF SCOTTISH FISHERY BOARD OFFICIALS.—Question, Mr. Lamont (Buteshire); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 197

INVENTION OF CAPS FOR ARMOUR PIERCING SHELLS.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Haldane 197

FROZEN MEAT FOR MILITIA BATTALIONS.—Question, Col. Kenyon-Slaney (Shropshire, Newport); Answer, Mr. Haldane 198

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 198

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE, KING'S BENCH DIVISION (ADDITIONAL JUDGE).—

The Attorney-General (Sir John Walton, Leeds, S.) 199

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty representing that the state of business in the High Court of Justice is such as to require the appointment of an Additional Judge, and praying that His Majesty will be graciously pleased to appoint a new Judge of the said High Court in the King's Bench Division thereof, in pursuance of the eighteenth section of The Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876."—(*The Attorney-General.*)

Mr. Buckmaster (Cambridge) 205
Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 213
Mr. H. J. Craig (Tynemouth) 217
Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.) 221
Mr. Bertram (Hertfordshire, Hitchin) 222
Mr. Clavell Salter (Hants, Basingstoke) 225
Mr. Radford (Islington, E.) 230
Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.) 231
Sir J. Jardine (Roxburghshire) 233
Mr. J. D. White (Dumbartonshire) 234
Sir John Walton 235

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 155; Noes, 41. (Division List, No. 279.)

Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty representing that the state of business in the High Court of Justice is such as to require the appointment of an additional Judge, and praying that His Majesty will be graciously pleased to appoint a new Judge of the said High Court in the King's Bench Division thereof, in pursuance of the eighteenth section of The Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876.

To be presented by Members of the Privy Council and of His Majesty's Household.

Telegraph (Money) Bill.—As amended (by the Standing Committee) considered.

Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 237

July 11.]

Page

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 7, to leave out from the word 'system,' to the word 'issue' in line 8.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

The Postmaster-General (*Mr. Sydney Burton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar*) .. 238
Mr. Bowles (*Lambeth, Norwood*) 239
Mr. T. L. Corbett (*Down, N.*) 239

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Bowles 239
Sir F. Banbury 240

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 9, after the word 'sums,' to insert the words, 'not exceeding one and a half million pounds in any one financial year, and.'"—(*Mr. Bowles.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Mr. Sydney Buxton 240
Viscount Turnour (*Sussex, Horsham*) 241
Mr. Harold Cox (*Preston*) 242
Mr. Carlile (*Hertfordshire, St. Albans*) 242
Mr. T. L. Corbett 242
Mr. Rawlinson (*Cambridge University*) 243
Mr. Steadman (*Finsbury, Central*) 243
Mr. Ashley (*Lancashire, Blackpool*) 244
Mr. Sydney Buxton 246

Question put—

The House divided:—Ayes, 22; Noes, 189. (Division List, No. 280.)

Mr. Harold Cox 247
Mr. Gretton (*Rutland*) 249

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 10, to leave out the word 'six' and insert the word 'three.'"—(*Mr. Harold Cox.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'six' stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Rees (*Montgomery Boroughs*) 250
Viscount Turnour 251
Mr. Sydney Buxton 253
Lord Balcarres (*Lancashire, Chorley*) 254
Mr. Helme (*Lancashire, Lancaster*) 255
Mr. Byles (*Salford, N.*) 255
Sir F. Banbury 256
Mr. Rawlinson 258

July 15.] Page

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 172 ; Noes, 24. (Division List No. 281).

And, it being Five of the Clock, further proceeding on consideration of the Bill, as amended, stood adjourned.

Bill, as amended (by the Standing Committee), to be further considered upon Monday next.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP J.)—Major SEELY reported from the Committee on Group J. of Private Bills : that Mr. Straus, one of the Members of the said Committee, was not present during the sitting of the Committee this day.

Report to lie upon the Table 260

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to Standing Order No. 3.

Adjourned at five minutes after Five o'clock, till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 15TH JULY, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bills :—Board of Education Scheme (Hulme Trust Estates Educational) Confirmation ; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7).

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 261

Bude Gas Bill ; King's Norton and Northfield Urban District Council Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments ; and passed, and returned to the Commons 261

London County Council (General Powers) Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1ª, and referred to the Examiners 261

Dundee Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.] ; Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 1.) Bill [H.L.] ; Pontypridd Urban District Council Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to 261

Kendal Corporation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 261

Wisbech Water Bill [H.L.] ; United Methodist Church Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments : the said Amendments considered, and agreed to 261

Great Northern and City Railway Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendment agreed to 261

Rawtenstall Corporation Bill; Great Central Railway Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 261

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill.—Read 3^a (according to order), with the Amendments; and passed, and returned to the Commons 261

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.].—Read 3^a (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 262

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.—Report from the Committee of Selection, that the following Lords be proposed to the House as the panel of Lords to act as Commissioners under the Act, viz.:—

L. Stewart of Garlies (*E. Galloway*),
L. Sanderson;

agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly 262

TREATY SERIES, No. 18. (1907).—General Index to Treaty Series, 1902–1906 .. 262

IMPERIAL COLLEGE.—Imperial College of Science and Technology, Charter of Incorporation (8th July, 1907) 262

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3857. United States (Texas) 262

ARMY.—Principles to be kept in view in training the Territorial Force and the Special Contingent.

Report of the Conference appointed to examine the shops and machinery at Woolwich Arsenal (except Danger Buildings and Torpedo Factory), in order to consider whether any article not now made in the Ordnance Factories can appropriately be made there with this machinery; with minutes of proceedings and appendices 262

GOVERNMENT FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS COMMITTEE.—Report of the Government Factories and Workshops Committee.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 262

ARMY.—(Army Reserve).—Further regulations relating to the Army Reserve.

(Militia).—Further regulations relating to the militia 262

SUPERANNUATION.—Treasury minute, dated 2nd July, 1907, granting a retired allowance to Hugo Meyer, late counter clerk and telegraphist, Post Office, under Section 2 of the Superannuation Act, 1887 263

POST OFFICE.—(Foreign and Colonial Post).—The Foreign and Colonial Post Amendment (No. 17) Warrant, 1907, dated 24th June, 1907.

(Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post).—The Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 7) Warrant, 1907, dated 24th June, 1907 263

July 11.] Page

COMPANIES (WINDING-UP).—Sixteenth General Annual Report by the Board of Trade under Section 29 of the Companies (Winding-up) Act, 1890 263

PACIFIC CABLE ACT, 1901 (ACCOUNT 1906–1907).—Account showing the money issued from the Consolidated Fund under the provisions of the Pacific Cable Act, 1901, and the money received, expended, and borrowed, and securities created under the said Act, to the 31st March, 1907; together with report of the Chairman of the Pacific Cable Board.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 263

ARMY (PAY, NON-EFFECTIVE PAY, AND ALLOWANCES.)—Lists of exceptions to the Army Regulations as to pay, non-effective pay, and allowances sanctioned during the year 1906–1907. Presented (pursuant to Royal Warrant dated 27th October, 1884), and ordered to lie on the Table 263

BATTLESHIPS AND ARMOURED CRUISERS.—Return showing the comparative strength in completed first-class battleships less than twenty-five years old, and armoured cruisers less than twenty years old of Great Britain, the United States of America, France, Germany, and Japan, on 1st June, 1907. Presented (pursuant to order of the 4th instant), and to be printed. (No. 111) 263

Lights on Vehicles Bill.—Brought from the Commons, and read 1ª, and to be printed. (No. 112) 264

PYROTECHNIC MORSE CODE.

Lord Muskerry 264
The Earl of Granard 264

Qualification of Women (County and Town Councils) (Scotland) Bill [H.L.]. [SECOND READING].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Hamilton of Dalzell 264

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Hamilton of Dalzell.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Imported Watch-Cases Bill [SECOND READING].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of Granard 267

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill.

The Duke of Bedford 267
The Under-Secretary of State for War (*The Earl of Portsmouth*) .. 268

July 15.] Page

THE STATE OF PUBLIC BUSINESS.

The Earl of Camperdown 269
Lord Ribblesdale 281
The Lord President of the Council (*The Earl of Crewe*) 284
The Marquess of Lansdowne 290
The Lord Chancellor (*Lord Loreburn*) 294

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 15TH JULY, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

New Writ for the County of Stafford (North Western Division), in the room of Alfred Billson, esquire, deceased.—(*Mr. Whiteley*) 298

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow 299

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz. :—Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow 299

Leeds Corporation Bill.—Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to .. 299

Devonport Corporation Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 299

London County Council (General Powers) Bill (PRINCE OF WALES' CONSENT SIGNIFIED).—Bill read the third time, and passed 299

Tees Valley Water (Consolidation) Bill [LORDS] (KING'S CONSENT SIGNIFIED).—Bill read the third time, and passed with Amendments 299

Ashton-under-Lyne, Stalybridge, and Dukinfield (District) Waterworks Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 299

July 15.] *Page*

Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 299

Portishead District Water Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed 300

Portobello and Musselburgh Tramways (Levenhall Extension) Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Considered; to be read the third time upon Wednesday 300

Humber Conservancy Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 300

Private Bills (Group G.).—Sir Henry Kimber reported from the Committee on Group B. of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties concerned, the Committee had adjourned until Monday next, at half-past Two of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table 300

Message from the Lords.—That they have agreed to:—London United Tramways Bill, without Amendment.

Amendments to:—King Edward's Hospital Fund for London Bill [Lords]; Heywood and Middleton Water Board Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act to enable Provisional Orders to be made for regulating Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries." [Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Tralee and Fenit and Wicklow." [Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords].

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under the General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Southwold." [Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [Lords] .. 300

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 277] 300

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 278] 301

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Army.—Copy presented, of Report of the Conference appointed to examine the Shops and Machinery at Woolwich Arsenal (except Danger Buildings and Torpedo Factory) in order to consider whether any article not now made in the Ordnance Factories can appropriately be made there with this Machinery [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 301

July 15.]

Page

ARMY.—Copy presented, of Statement of Principles to be kept in view in training the Territorial Force and the Special Contingent [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 301

ARMY (PAY, NON-EFFECTIVE PAY AND ALLOWANCES).—Copy presented of List of Exceptions to the Army Regulations as to Pay, Non-effective Pay, and Allowances sanctioned during the year 1906–7 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 301

ARMY (MILITIA).—Copy presented, of Further Regulations relating to the Militia [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 301

ARMY RESERVE.—Copy presented, of Further Regulations relating to the Army Reserve [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 301

EMPLOYMENT OF CHILDREN ACT, 1903 (BYE-LAWS).—Return presented, relative thereto [Address, 25th June; Mr. Tennant; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 249] 301

GOVERNMENT FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS COMMITTEE.—Copy presented, of Report of the Government Factories and Workshops Committee [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 302

PACIFIC CABLE ACT, 1901.—Account presented, showing the Money issued from the Consolidated Fund under the provisions of The Pacific Cable Act, 1901, and of the Money received, expended, and borrowed, and Securities created under the said Act, to 31st March, 1907, together with a Copy of the Report of the Chairman of the Pacific Cable Board [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 250] 302

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1887.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute dated 2nd July, 1907, granting to Hugo Meyer, later Counter Clerk and Telegraphist, Post Office, a retiring allowance under the Act [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 302

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL POST).—Copy presented, of the Foreign and Colonial Post Amendment (No. 17) Warrant, 1907, dated 24th June, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 302

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL PARCEL POST).—Copy presented, of the Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 7) Warrant, 1907, dated 24th June, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 302

TREATY SERIES (No. 18, 1907).—Copy presented, of General Index to Treaty Series, 1902–6 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 302

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No. 3857 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 302

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

POSITION OF MR. MAULL, SUB-POSTMASTER AT KINGSTON-ON-THAMES.—Question, Mr. Cave, (Surrey, Kingston); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 302

SEA TRAINING OF BOYS IN THE NAVY.—Question, Mr. Nield (Middlesex, Ealing); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 303

July 15.]

Page

TURKISH FINANCE—MACEDONIAN BUDGET DEFICIT.—Question, Mr. Lynch; Answer, Mr. Runciman 322

OTTOMAN PUBLIC DEBT COUNCIL.—Question, Mr. Lynch; Answer, Mr. Runciman 323

TURKISH RAILWAY GUARANTEES.—Question, Mr. Lynch; Answer, Mr. Runciman 324

GERMANY AND TURKISH FINANCE.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, Mr. Runciman 324

DEATH DUTIES.—Question, Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) 325

SCOTLAND EDUCATION EQUIVALENT GRANT.—Question, Mr. Cochrane; Answer, Mr. Asquith 325

IMPORTS DUTIES.—Question, Mr. Hunt; Answer, Mr. Asquith 326

LAND VALUES.—Question, Mr. Fell; Answer, Mr. Asquith 326

EPILEPTICS AND THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT.—Questions, Mr. Gulland (Dumfries Burghs), Sir J. Randles (Cumberland, Cockermouth); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 327

MR. A. A. LYNCH'S PARDON.—Questions, Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.), Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham); Answers, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.) 328

MR. RONALDSON, SCOTTISH MINE INSPECTOR.—Question, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 328

HACKNEY CARRIAGES.—Question, Mr. Straus (Tower Hamlets, Mile End); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 329

TAXIMETERS.—Question, Mr. Straus; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 329

CHARITABLE EMPLOYMENTS.—Question, Mr. Arthur Henderson (Durham, Barnard Castle); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 329

WAGE PARTICULARS.—Question, Mr. Arthur Henderson; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 330

HALF-TIME CHILD LABOUR.—Question, Mr. Byles; Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. 330

WOMEN WORKER'S WAGE DEDUCTIONS.—Question, Mr. Byles; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 331

FACTORY INSPECTORS' REPORTS ON OFFENDERS.—Question, Mr. Chiozza Money (Paddington, N.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 331

GIRL LABOUR IN FACTORIES.—Questions, Mr. Chiozza Money, Viscount Turnour, Mr. Hunt; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 331

LOANS FOR FERRO-CONCRETE WORKS.—Question, Mr. Whitehead (Essex, S.E.); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 333

Loans to Local Authorities.—Question, Mr. Whitehead; Answer, Mr. John Burns 333

Wages in Protective Countries.—Question, Mr. Arthur Henderson; Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (Mr. Kearley, Devonport) 333

Cunard Steamers and Halifax.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox; Answer, Mr. Kearley 334

Steamship Insurance.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox; Answer, Mr. Kearley .. 334

Companies Bill, Clause 23.—Question, Mr. Cheetham (Stalybridge); Answer, Mr. Kearley 334

School Hygiene.—Questions, Dr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford), Mr. Alden (Middlesex, Tottenham), Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald; Answers, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouth, N.) 335

New General Post Office.—Question, Mr. Whitehead; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Harcourt, Lancashire, Rossendale) 336

Marking of Imported Cardboard Boxes.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Runciman 336

Discharges of Boy Clerks.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay; Answer, Mr. Runciman 337

Passive Resisters and Scottish Church Assessments.—Question, Mr. Menzies (Lanarkshire, S.); Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 337

Rector of Fordyce Academy.—Question, Mr. McCrae (Edinburgh, E.); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 338

Fife Coast Fisheries.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 338

Ireland and the Butter and Margarine Bill.—Questions, Mr. P. A. McHugh (Sligo, N.), Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answers, The Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland (Mr. T. W. Russell, Tyrone, S.) 339

Clare Potatoe Crop.—Question, Mr. William Redmond; Answer, Mr. T. W. Russell 339

Irish Milk Industry.—Question, Mr. Halpin (Clare, W.), Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answers, Mr. T. W. Russell 340

Tottenham Estate, Leitrim.—Question, Mr. P. A. McHugh (Sligo, N.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 341

Derrahiney Estate, Galway.—Question, Mr. John Roche (Galway, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 342

United Irish League and Grazing Farms.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid); Answer, Mr. Birrell 342

July 15.]

Page

AGRARIAN OUTRAGES.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell 342

DERELICT EVICTED FARMS.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 343

EVICTED TENANTS AND VOLUNTARY SURRENDERS.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell 343

BALLYDOWD EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Meagher (Kilkenny, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 344

CLIFDEN PIER, GALWAY.—Question, Mr. O'Malley (Galway, Connemara); Answer, Mr. Birrell 344

WEST OF IRELAND CROPS.—Question, Mr. O'Malley; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 345

BELFAST HEALTH COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 346

HONOURS AND PARTY FUNDS.—A QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 346

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the letter of the hon. Member for East St. Pancras, published in *The Times* newspaper of Friday last, is a breach of the privileges of this House, and that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the allegations made in the letter by the hon. Member, and to report their opinion thereupon to the House."—*(Lord R. Cecil.)*

Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.) 349
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 351

Amendment proposed :—

" To leave out the words after the word 'that,' in order to insert the words 'this House do now proceed to the business of the day.' "

Question proposed, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 354
Lord R. Cecil 355
Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe) 356
Mr. R. Duncan (Lanarkshire, Govan) 356
Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Manfield) 356

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 120; Noes, 235. (Division List, No. 282.)

Proposed words added.

Main Question, as amended, put and agreed to.

Resolved, " That this House do now proceed to the business of the day."

Petty Sessions Clerks (Ireland) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments, from Standing Committee F.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 251.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 251.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration to-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 276] 361

POST OFFICE SERVANTS.—Ordered, "That the Minutes of the Evidence taken before the Select Committee on Post Office Servants in Session 1906, be referred to the Select Committee on Post Office Servants."—(*Mr. Hobhouse.*) 361

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C. (added in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. Lambert; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. Bennett.

Report to lie upon the Table 362

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (COLONIAL PREFERENCE).—Ordered, "That the proceedings on the Motion relating to Colonial Preference, if under discussion at Eleven o'clock this night, be not interrupted under the Standing Order (Sittings of the House)."—(*Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*) 362

COLONIAL PREFERENCE.

Mr. Lyttelton (*St. George's, Hanover Square*) 363

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House regrets that His Majesty's Government have declined the invitation unanimously preferred by the Prime Ministers of the Self-governing Colonies to consider favourably any form of Colonial Preference or any measures for closer commercial union of the Empire on a preferential basis." —(*Mr. Lyttelton.*)

Mr. Soares (*Devonshire, Barnstaple*) 376
Mr. Simon (*Essex, Walthamstow*) 386

Amendment proposed to the proposed Resolution—

"In line 1, to leave out all after the word 'that,' and add the words 'in the opinion of this House, the permanent unity of the British Empire will not be secured through a system of preferential duties based upon the protective taxation of food.'"—(*Mr. Soares.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

July 16.] Page

Lord Ronaldshay (Middlesex, Hornsey) 392
The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 399
Mr. Chaplin (Surrey, Wimbledon) 412
Mr. Curran (Durham, Jarrow) 426
Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 430
The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 436
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 447
The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) .. 457

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 111; Noes, 404. (Division List No. 283.)

Proposed words added.

Main Question, as Amended, put, and agreed to.

Resolved, That, in the opinion of this House, the permanent unity of the British Empire will not be secured through a system of preferential duties based upon the protective taxation of food.

SUGAR.—Return ordered, "showing, with regard to London, Paris, and Berlin, the price of sugar and the duty levied thereon on the 1st day of March, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906, and 1907 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 132, of Session 1906)."—*(Mr. Pike Pease.)* 464

NEW WRIT.—New Writ for the County of Kilkenny (South Kilkenny Division), in the room of James O'Mara, esquire (Chiltern Hundreds).—*(Captain Donelan)* 464

Adjourned at Twenty-nine minutes after Eleven o'Clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 16TH JULY, 1907.

Godfrey Charles Baron Tredegar having been created Viscount Tredegar of Tredegar, in the county of Monmouth—Was (in the usual manner) introduced 465

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.] (UNOPPOSED ORDERS).—Reported, with Amendments 465

Sunderland Corporation Bill; London County Council (Money) Bill; Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill; Richmond (Surrey) Electricity Supply Bill; North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill.—Reported, with Amendments 465

Armagh Urban District Council Bill; Collooney, Ballina, and Belmullet Railways and Piers Bill.—The King's consent signified; and Bills reported, with Amendments 465

July 16.] *Page*

London and North-Western Railway Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 465

Worthing Gas Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments; and passed, and returned to the Commons 465

Devonport Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Tees Valley Water Consolidation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments: The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 465

Leeds Corporation Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 465

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.].—Re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow 465

Kendal Corporation Bill [H.L.].—Commons' Amendments considered, and agreed to 465

PETITION.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister.—Petition in favour of legislation of, of Provost, etc., of Dunfermline; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 466

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Trade Reports: Annual Series.

No. 3858. Persia (Bunder Abbas and Lingah) 466

Treaty Series, No. 19. (1907).—Agreement between the United Kingdom and Norway respecting the mutual surrender of fugitive criminals; signed at Christiania, 18th February, 1907.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 466

East India (Examinations for the Civil Service).—Regulations for admission to the Indian Civil Service, alteration to paragraph 9 466

Board of Agriculture and Fisheries.—First Report by the President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries as a Commissioner of Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues by virtue of the Crown Lands Act, 1906.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 466

Advertisements Regulation Bill.—Reported from the Standing Committee with further Amendments: The Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the Whole House and by the Standing Committee to be received To-morrow; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 113) 466

British North America Bill.

House in Committee (according to Order).

[The Earl of Onslow in the Chair.]

July 16.] Page

Clause 1—

The Secretary of State for the Colonies (The Earl of Elgin) 466

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 4, at the beginning of paragraph (*b*) to insert the words 'subject to the special provisions of this Act as to the provinces of British Columbia and Prince Edward Island.'"—(*The Earl of Elgin.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 38, after the word 'substituted' to insert the following new subsection:—'(8) In the case of the provinces of British Columbia and Prince Edward Island, the amount paid on account of the grant payable per head of the population to the provinces under this Act shall not at any time be less than the amount of the corresponding grant payable at the commencement of this Act; and if it is found on any decennial census that the population of the province has decreased since the last decennial census, the amount paid on account of the grant shall not be decreased below the amount then payable, notwithstanding the decrease of the population.'"—(*The Earl of Elgin.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2, agreed to.

Schedule—

The Earl of Elgin 467

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, to insert as a schedule:—'Schedule. To the King's Most Excellent Majesty. Most Gracious Sovereign, We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Senate and Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty for the purpose of representing that it is expedient to amend the scale of payments authorised under Section 118 of the Acts of the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, commonly called the British North America Act, 1867, or by or under any terms or conditions upon which any other provinces were admitted to the Union, to be made by Canada to the several provinces of the Dominion for the support of their Governments and Legislatures by providing that: A.—Instead of the amounts now payable, the sums hereafter payable yearly by Canada to the several provinces for the support of their Governments and Legislatures be according to population, and as follows: (*a*) Where the population of the province is under 150,000, $100,000; (*b*) Where the population of the province is 150,000, but does not exceed 200,000, $150,000; (*c*) Where the population of the province is 200,000, but does not exceed 400,000, $180,000 : (*d*) Where the population of the province is 400,000, but does not exceed 800,000, $190,000 : (*e*) Where the population of the province is 800,000, but does not exceed 1,500,000, $220,000 ; (*f*) Where the population of the province exceeds 1,500,000, $240,000. B.—Instead of an annual grant per head of population now allowed, the annual payment hereafter be at the same rate of eighty cents per head, but on the population of each province, as ascertained from time to time by the last decennial census, or in the case of the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta respectively, by the last quinquennial census or statutory estimate, until such population exceds 2,500,000, and at the rate of sixty cents per head for so much of said population as may exceed 2,500,000. C.—An additional allowance to the extent of one hundred thousand dollars annually be paid for ten years to the province of British Columbia. D.—Nothing herein contained shall in any way supersede or affect the terms special to any particular province upon which such province became part of the Dominion of Canada, or the right of any province to the payment of any special grant heretofore made by the Parliament of Canada to any province for any special purpose in such grant expressed. We pray that Your Majesty may be graciously pleased to cause a measure to be laid before the Imperial Parliament at its present session repealing the provisions of Section 118 of the British North America Act, 1867, aforesaid, and substituting therefor the scale of payments above set forth, which shall be a final and unalterable settlement of the amounts to be paid yearly to the several provinces of the Dominion for their local purposes, and the support of their Governments and Legislatures. Such grants shall be paid half-yearly in advance to each province, but the Government of Canada shall deduct from such grants as against any province all sums chargeable as interest on the public debt of that province in excess of the several amounts stipulated in the said Act. All of which we humbly pray Your Majesty to take into your favourable and gracious consideration.

'(Signed) R. DANDURAND,
Speaker of the Senate.

'(Signed) R. F. SUTHERLAND,
Speaker of the House of Commons.

'Senate and House of Commons,
Ottawa, Canada,
26th April, 1907.' "

—(*The Earl of Elgin.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Preamble—

Amendment moved—

" In page 1, to insert as a preamble to the Bill the words 'Whereas an address has been presented to His Majesty by the Senate and Commons of Canada in the terms set forth in the Schedule to this Act.' "—(*The Earl of Elgin.*)

July 16.] *Page*

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Consequential Amendment agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow; and Bill to be printed as Amended. (No. 114.)

Limited Partnerships Bill.—Report of Amendments received.

The Earl of Granard 469

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 16, to leave out from the word 'Act' to the end of the clause."—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

Consequential Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Granard 470

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 4, page 2, line 11, to leave out from the word 'firm' to the end of subsection (3) and to insert the words 'up to the amount so drawn out or 'received back.'"—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Granard 470

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 4, page 2, lines 15 and 16, to leave out subsection (4)."—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

Lord Avebury 470

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Granard 470

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 6, page 3, line 2, after '1900' to insert the words 'and the provisions of those Acts relating to the winding-up of companies by the Court and of the rules made thereunder (including provisions as to fees) shall, subject to such modifications (if any) as the Lord Chancellor, with the concurrence of the President of the Board of Trade, may by rules provide, apply to the winding-up by the Court of limited partnerships, with the substitution of general partners for directors."—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Consequential Amendments agreed to.

The Earl of Granard 471

Amendment moved—

> "In Clause 9, page 4, line 10, after the word 'term' to insert the words 'or character.'"—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Consequential Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Granard 471

Amendment moved—

> "In Clause 9, page 4, line 12, after the word 'partner' to insert '(*g*) the liability of any partner by reason of his becoming a limited instead of a general partner or a general instead of a limited partner."—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Granard 471

Amendment moved—

> "In Clause 9, page 4, line 18, after the first 'the' to insert the word 'general.'"—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

> "To leave out Clause 10."—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendments agreed to.

Amendment moved—

> "After Clause 9 to insert the following new clause:—'(1) Notice of any arrangement or transaction under which any person will cease to be a general partner in any firm and will become a limited partner in that firm, or under which the share of a limited partner in a firm will be assigned to any person, shall be forthwith advertised in the *Gazette*, and until notice of the arrangement or transaction is so advertised, the arrangement or transaction shall, for the purposes of this Act, be deemed to be of no effect. (2) For the purposes of this section, the expression 'the *Gazette*' means—In the case of a limited partnership registered in England, the London *Gazette*; in the case of a limited partnership registered in Scotland, the Edinburgh *Gazette*; in the case of a limited partnership registered in Ireland, the Dublin *Gazette*.'"—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next; and to be printed as amended. (No. 115.)

Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) Bill [H.L.].—Amendments reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3ª on Tuesday next 472

Imported Watch-Cases Bill.

House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment, and re-committed to the Standing Committee 473

FIJI.

Lord Stanmore 473

Moved, That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty for any correspondence between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Governor of Fiji respecting the sale of certain lands in the Provinces of Rewa and Naitasiri.—(*Lord Stanmore.*)

The Secretary of State for the Colonies (The Earl of Elgin) 480

On Question, Motion agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

MOTOR CAR LEGISLATION.

Earl Russell 483
Lord Montagu of Beaulieu 487
Lord Allendale 488
The Marquess of Londonderry 489

DIVORCE IN IRELAND.

Earl Russell 490

Moved, "That there be laid before the House a Return of all private Bills presented during the last five years for effecting divorces, showing whether the petition was presented by husband or wife, what was the matrimonial offence alleged, the Parliamentary history of the Bill, and the total cost to the parties."—(*Earl Russell.*)

The Lord Chancellor (Lord Loreburn) 491

Moved, "That there be laid before the House a Return (omitting names) of all Private Bills presented during the last five years for effecting divorces, showing whether the petition was presented by husband or wife, what was the matrimonial offence alleged, the result, and the Parliamentary cost to the parties."—(*Earl Russell.*)

Lord Ashbourne 492

On Question, Motion agreed to.

THE TERRITORIAL ARMY.

Lord Montagu of Beaulieu 494
The Lord Chancellor 495
The Marquess of Salisbury 495

CROWN ESTATES AND SMALL HOLDINGS.

Viscount Hill 496

Moved, "That there be laid before the House a Return of the farms belonging to the Crown Estates which have been or are being converted into small holdings, showing in each case—(1) The acreage of the converted farm, the name of the tenant, and the number of labourers employed upon it; (2) The number of holdings into which the farm is now divided or being divided, with names of occupants, distinguishing between agricultural labourers previously employed upon the farm, agricultural labourers previously employed in the neighbourhood, and tradesmen or artisans."—(*Viscount Hill.*)

Lord Heneage 498
The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (Earl Carrington) 502
The Marquess of Lansdowne 508
Lord Ribblesdale 510
Earl Carrington 510

Motion, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 16TH JULY, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Water Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time, and committed 511

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [LORDS]; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed 511

Renfrewshire Upper District (Eastwood and Mearns) Water Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 511

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.—Second Report brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 252] .. 511

Killery's Divorce Bill [LORDS].—Reported from the Select Committee on Divorce Bills, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time 511

July 16.]

Killery's Divorce Bill [Lords].—Ordered, That the Minutes of Evidence and Proceedings in the House of Lords on the Second Reading of Killery's Divorce Bill [Lords], together with the Documents deposited in the case, be returned to the House of Lords: And that the Clerk do carry the same. —(*Mr. Attorney-General*) 511

Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 280] .. 512

Message from the Lords.—That they have agreed to: Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill; Bude Gas Bill; King's Norton and Northfield Urban District Council Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to: Wisbech Water Bill [Lords]; United Methodist Church Bill [Lords], without Amendment 512

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill [Lords].—Amendments to be considered To-morrow 512

PETITIONS.

Vivisection (Prohibition).—Petition from Manchester and other places, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 512

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Treaty Series (No. 19, 1907).—Copy presented, of Agreement between the United Kingdom and Norway respecting the Mutual Surrender of Fugitive Criminals. Signed at Christiania, 18th February, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 512

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No. 3858 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 512

Boiler Explosions Acts, 1882 and 1890.—Copy presented, of Report to the Secretary of the Board of Trade upon the working of the Boiler Explosions Acts, 1882 and 1890, with Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 512

East India (Examinations for the Civil Service).—Copy presented, of Regulations for Admission to the Indian Civil Service; alteration to paragraph 9 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 513

Crown Lands Act, 1906.—Copy presented, of First Report by the President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, as a Commissioner of Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues, by virtue of the Crown Lands Act, 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 513

Poor Law Relief (Ireland).—Return ordered, "showing for each Poor Law Union in Ireland—

(1) The number of men, women, and children, respectively (excluding tramp night lodgers), who were in receipt of Poor Law Relief at any time during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1908;

(2) The number of such men, women, and children, respectively, who were: (*a*) persons relieved singly; (*b*) heads of families; (*c*) dependants of paupers;

(3) The number of such men, women, and children, respectively, who received: (*a*) indoor relief only; (*b*) outdoor relief only; (*c*) both indoor and outdoor relief;

(4) The total number of persons included in (1), classified according to the aggregate length of time during which they received relief; and

(5) The number of persons in each of the classes indicated in (4), re-classified according to the number of times on which relief was granted."—(*Mr. Birrell*) 513

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Publication of Report of Inquiry into Bay of Firth (Orkney) Oyster Order.—Question, Sir Arthur Bignold (Wick Burghs); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 513

Dock Accommodation for Battleships on the East Coast.—Question, Mr. Nield (Middlesex, Ealing); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 514

Labourers Acts —Application of Michael Delaney.—Question, Mr. Sheehan (Cork County, Mid); Answer, Mr. Birrell 514

Post Office Servants Committee Report.—Question, Mr. Wiles (Islington, S.); Answer, Mr. Hobhouse 515

Payment for Use of Bell Rock, Skerryvore, and Dhu Heartach Rock.—Question, Mr. J. D. White (Dumbartonshire); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 515

Loans to Irish Local Bodies for Public Work.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. Runciman 515

Kew Gardeners.—Question, Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland); Answer, Sir E. Strachey 516

Sunday Delivery of Letters in the Riverstown Postal District.—Question, Mr. H. Roche (Cork); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 516

Messrs John Brown and Co., and Vickers, Sons, and Maxim, and the Fair Wages Resolution.—Question, Mr. W. T. Wilson (Lancashire, Westhoughton); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 517

Police Note-taker at Meeting at Newtownforbes.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 517

Sale of the Douglas Estate, Longford.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Birrell 518

Relief of Distress in Ireland.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Birrell 518

July 16.] *Page*

Return of Irish Department Cost, Income, and Expenditure.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 518

Evicted Tenants Application of A. H. Armstrong.—Question, Mr. Patrick White (Meath, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 519

Great Western Railway and Conveyance of Devonshire Volunteer Regiments to Camp.—Question, Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple); Answer, Mr. Haldane 519

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Destroyers.—Questions, Sir Berkeley Sheffield, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answers, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Lambert, Devonshire, South Molton) 520

British and German Fleets.—Questions, Sir Berkeley Sheffield, Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.), Mr. Bellairs; Answers, Mr. Lambert 521

H.M.S. "Dreadnought."—Question, Sir Berkeley Sheffield; Answer, Mr. Lambert 521

Ships' Armaments.—Question, Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye); Answer, Mr. Lambert 521

Rye Bay Fishing.—Question, Mr. Courthope; Answer, Mr. Lambert 522

Inspection of Contract Work.—Questions, Mr. Courthope, Mr. Arthur Henderson (Durham, Barnard Castle); Answer, Mr. Lambert 523

Sales of Obsolete War Vessels.—Question, Mr. Watt (Glasgow College); Answer, Mr. Lambert 523

Rosyth.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray (St. Andrews Burghs); Answer, Mr. Lambert 524

Army Pensions.—Questions, Captain Faber (Hampshire, Andover), Mr. Crooks (Woolwich); Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddingtonshire) 524

Cartridges for Morris Tubes.—Question, Captain Faber; Answer, Mr. Haldane 525

Bonuses for the Special Contingents.—Question, Mr. Courthope; Answer, Mr. Haldane 525

Indian Rupee Coinage.—Question, Mr. R. Duncan (Lanarkshire, Govan); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) .. 525

The Unrest in India.—Questions, Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.), Captain Faber, Mr. Mackarness (Berkshire, Newbury), Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs), Mr. O'Grady (Leeds, E.), Mr. Lynch (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon); Answers, Mr. Morley, Mr. Speaker 526

Deaths from Plague in India.—Question, Dr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford); Answer, Mr. Morley 531

Page

Rack Taxing in Rural India.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, Mr. Morley .. 531

Arracan Capitation Tax.—Question, Mr. Harmood-Banner (Liverpool, Everton); Answer, Mr. Morley 531

German Steamships to Canada.—Question, Captain Faber; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 532

Colonial Governorships.—Question, Mr. Watt; Answer, Mr. Churchill .. 532

New Hebrides Convention.—Questions, Mr. Staveley-Hill (Staffordshire, Kingswinford), Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answers, Mr. Churchill 532

The Knight Commander.—Questions, Major Anstruther-Gray, Mr. Hart-Davies (Hackney, N.); Answers, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) 533

Mr. Abbott's Ransom.—Question, Major Anstruther Gray; Answer, Sir E. Grey 533

British Trade Route in Persia.—Question, Mr. Lynch; Answer, Sir E. Grey 534

Egyptian Census.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside); Answer, Sir E. Grey 534

Khedivial School of Law.—Questions, Dr. Rutherford, Mr. J. M. Robertson, Sir Gilbert Parker, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Sir Edward Grey .. 535

Income-Tax.—Question, Mr. R. Duncan; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fife, E.) 536

Income-Tax and Sewers.—Question, Mr. William Abraham (Glamorganshire, Rhondda); Answer, Mr. Asquith 536

Irish Loans.—Question, Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.); Answer, Mr. Asquith 537

Case of Albert Bach.—Question, Mr. Watt; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 538

Employment of Young People. Question, Mr. George Roberts (Norwich); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 538

Training of Nurses.—Question, Mr. Hart-Davies; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 539

Private Burying Grounds.—Questions, Mr. H. Beaumont (Sussex, Eastbourne), Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.); Answers, Mr. Gladstone 539

Gloucester Port Dues.—Question, Mr. Hicks Beach (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 539

County Court Fees.—Question, Mr. Ferens (Hull, E.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) 540

July 16.]

Page

Hop Substitutes.—Question, Mr. Courthope; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 540

Royal Gardens, Kew.—Question, Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland); Answer, The Treasurer of the Household (Sir E. Strachey, Somersetshire, S.) .. 541

The Public Trustee.—Questions, Mr. Bottomley (Hackney, S.), Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, The Attorney-General (Sir John Walton, Leeds, S.) .. 542

Royal Flag.—Question, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. Buchanan, Perthshire, E.) .. 543

Cost of Police in County Clare.—Question, Mr. Halpin (Clare, W.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 544

Goff Estate, Roscommon.—Question, Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 544

Irish Education Grant.—Question, Mr. Meagher (Kilkenny, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 545

Earl of Dunraven's Estate.—Question, Mr. Lundon (Limerick, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 545

Foreign Office Vote.—Questions, Mr. Lynch, Mr. J. M. Robertson, Mr. Rees, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 546

Worcester Election Petition.—Question, Mr. Snowden (Blackburn); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 547

Pacific Islanders Act Amendment Bill.—Question, Mr. Staveley-Hill; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 547

Supply.—Question, Mr. Harmood-Banner; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 547

Business of the House.—Question, Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 548

Honours and Party Funds—Personal Explanation.

Mr. H. C. Lea (St. Pancras, E.) 548

Selection (Standing Committees).—Sir William Brampton Gurdon reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee C (added in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. Hodge and Mr. Gill; and had reinstated on the Committee: Mr. Shackleton and Mr. John Taylor (previously discharged in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill).

Sir William Brampton Gurdon further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C (added in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. Jowett; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. George Roberts.

Reports to lie upon the Table 550

July 16.] *Page*

NEW BILL.

Larceny Bill.—" To amend the Larceny Act, 1861," presented by Mr. Courthope; supported by Sir John Dickson-Poynder, Mr. Warner, Mr. James Mason, Mr. Leif Jones, Mr. Hicks Beach, Mr. Lane-Fox, Mr. Everett, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Acland, Mr. Brace, and Mr. Verney; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 279] 550

Finance Bill.—As amended, (in Committee and on re-committal), considered.

Mr. C. E. Price (*Edinburgh, Central*) 550
Mr. J. M. Henderson (*Aberdeenshire, W.*) 552

New clause—

" Notices of assessment of income-tax shall be issued as nearly as may be in the same terms on or after the first day of December in each year, and the same shall become payable and shall be collected in the same form and at the same time in the United Kingdom, and legal proceedings in the respective countries for recovery of income-tax shall also be taken as nearly as may be at the same time."—(*Mr. C. E. Price*).

Brought, up and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the clause be read a second time."

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (*Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.*) .. 553
Mr. Austen Chamberlain (*Worcestershire, E.*) 553
Mr. McCrae (*Edinburgh, E.*) 554
Mr. Watt (*Glasgow College*) 555
Mr. Ellis (*Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe*) 556
Mr. Dalziel (*Kirkcaldy Burghs*) 557
Mr. Munro Ferguson (*Leith Burghs*) 557
Mr. Asquith 557
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 558
Mr. Harold Cox (*Preston*) 558
Mr. C. E. Price 558

Motion and clause, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Gretton (*Rutland*) 559
Sir Francis Lowe (*Birmingham, Edgbaston*) 562

New clause—

" As from the first day of January, ninteen hundred and eight, the duties imposed by Section 2 of the Finance Act, 1901, and by the First Schedule to that Act, shall each be reduced by one-half in respect of British and British Colonial grown sugar."—(*Mr. Gretton.*)

Brought up and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the clause be read a second time."

July 16.]

Page
Mr. Asquith 563
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 564
Mr. Asquith 565
Sir Edward Sassoon (Hythe) 565
Mr. Harold Cox (Preston) 566
Mr. Stuart Wortley (Sheffield, Hallam) 568

Motion and clause, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Hicks Beach (Gloucestershire Tewkesbury) 568
Captain Hervey (Bury St. Edmunds) 570

New clause—

"A landowner farming his own land may be assessed for income-tax under Schedule D in lieu of under Schedules A and B."—(*Mr. Hicks Beach.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Asquith 571
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 571
Sir F. Banbury 572
Sir Brampton Gurdon (Norfolk, N.) 572
Sir F. Cawley (Lancashire, Prestwich) 572

Motion and clause, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth) 573
Mr. Harmood-Banner (Liverpool, Everton) 574

New clause :—

"It shall be lawful for any company registered with limited liability, in estimating the amount of profits chargeable to income-tax, to deduct from such profits the expenses incurred in any issue of debenture or other capital, which expenses have to be, in whole or in part, paid out of the profits of that year."—(*Mr. Fell.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) .. 574
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 575
Mr. Asquith 575

Motion and clause, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University) 576
Sir F. Banbury 578

New clause :—

"Incomes of husband and wife shall be added together and divided by two for the purpose of ascertaining the exemption from or abatement of income-tax to which they are respectively entitled."—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

Brought up and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Asquith 578
Mr. Forster (*Kent, Sevenoaks*) 579

Motion and clause, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Rawlinson 579
Mr. Courthope (*Sussex, Rye*) 580

New clause :—

"Incomes which have already paid income-tax in the Colonies shall not be liable to be assessed for income-tax in Great Britain."—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Brought up and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Asquith 580
Sir Seymour King (*Hull, Central*) 581
Mr. Harmood-Banner 581
Mr. Asquith 581
Sir F. Banbury 581
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 582
Mr. Fell 583
Mr. Leverton Harris (*Tower Hamlets, Stepney*) 582

Question put, and negatived.

Mr. Courthope 583
Sir F. Banbury 584

New clause :—

"All death or succession duties payable in respect of land shall be payable, wholly or in part, in land which shall be valued at the assessment at which it was assessed for the purposes of such duties before any deductions whatsoever were made from such assessment."—(*Mr. Courthope.*)

Brought up and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed. "That this clause be read a second time."

July 16.]

Page
Mr. Asquith 586
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 587
Mr. Younger (Ayr Burghs) 588
Mr. Wyndham (Dover) 588
Mr. J. Parker (Halifax) 589

Question put:

The House divided:—Ayes, 65; Noes, 275. (Division List, No. 284.)

Amendment proposed:—

"In page 3, line 28, at the end, to insert the words '(a) Section eleven of The Finance Act, 1899 (which relates to policies of insurance in respect of injury to workmen), shall be read as if two pounds were substituted for one pound as the amount of the annual premium therein mentioned.'")—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted,"—put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed:—

"In page 3, to leave out Clause 9."—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Question, "That Clause 9 stand part of the Bill," Question put, and negatived.

The following Amendments were proposed by Mr. Asquith and agreed to—

"In page 3, line 39, to leave out the word 'passing,' and to insert the word 'commencement.'"

"In page 4, line 18, after the word 'the,' to insert the word 'loan.'"

"In page 4, line 24, after the word 'existing,' to insert the word 'loan.'"

"In page 6, line 3, at the end, to insert the words 'Provided that if as respects any such deduction the person by whom the duty is payable requires the Commissioners, on the first delivery of his account, to calculate the deduction as if this section had not passed, the deduction shall be so calculated.'"

"In page 8, line 33, after the word 'claim,' to insert the words 'for relief under this section.'"—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Mr. Asquith 593

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 20, page 9, line 11, at beginning, to insert the words 'any income arising in respect of.'"—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Page

Mr. Morton (Sutherland) .. 594
Mr. Smeaton (Stirlingshire) .. 594
Mr. Rawlinson .. 594
Mr. Austen Chamberlain .. 594

Question put, and agreed to.

The following Amendments were also agreed to—

"In page 9, line 12, to leave out the word 'including,' and to insert the words 'or in respect of.'"

"In page 9, line 13, after the word 'superannuation," to insert the words 'or other.''

"In page 9, line 13, to leave out the word 'or.'"

"In page 9, line 13, after the word 'pay,' to insert the words 'or compensation for loss of office, given.'"

"In page 9, line 14, after the word 'of,' to insert the word 'the.'" —(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 9, line 14, after the word 'services,' to insert the words 'of the individual or the husband or parent of the individual.'"—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Seymour King (Hull, Central) .. 595
Mr. Asquith .. 596
Sir J. Jardine (Roxburghshire). .. 596

Question put, and agreed to.

The following Amendments were also agreed to—

"In page 9, line 14, to leave out the word 'that,' and to insert the word 'any.'"

"In page 9, line 14, after the word 'employment,' to insert the words 'of profit.'"

"In page 9, line 16, to leave out the word 'such.'"—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Mr. Smeaton .. 597
Mr. Rawlinson .. 598
Mr. Asquith .. 598
Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.) .. 598
Mr. Rawlinson .. 598

Amendment agreed to.

July 16.] Page

Mr. Fell 599
Sir F. Banbury 599

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 9, line 24, at the end, to insert the words '(*d*) any annuity which has been purchased out of savings from income derived from the exercise of any trade, profession, or vocation.' "—(*Mr. Fell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Mr. Asquith 601
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 601

And, it being quarter-past Eight of the Clock, and there being Private Business set down by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill (BY ORDER).—Read a second time.

Mr. J. M. Henderson (Aberdeenshire, W.) 601
Mr. W. R. Rea (Scarborough) 604

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be referred to a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons.' "—(*Mr. J. M. Henderson.*)

Mr. Munro Ferguson (Leith Burghs) 607
Mr. C. E. Price (Edinburgh, Central) 610
Mr. Austin Taylor (Liverpool, East Toxteth) 612
Mr. Gulland (Dumfries Burghs) 615
The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 617
Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.) 619
Sir John Dewar (Inverness) 622
Mr. Stuart Wortley (Sheffield, Hallam) 624
Mr. Crombie (Kincardineshire) 625
Mr. Watt (Glasgow College) 626
Mr. Rainy (Kilmarnock Burghs) 627
Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland) 628

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 80 ; Noes, 236. (Division List No. 285.)

Bill to be considered To-morrow.

Finance Bill.

Postponed Proceeding on Amendment proposed, on consideration of the Bill, as amended, resumed.

Which Amendment was—

"In page 9, line 24, at the end to insert the words, '(d) any annuity which has been purchased out of savings from income derived from the exercise of any trade, profession, or vocation.' "—(*Mr. Fell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Mr. Hicks Beach 631

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 65 ; Noes, 260. (Division List No. 286.)

Amendments proposed and agreed to without discussion—

> "In page 10, line 9, to leave out the word 'provision,' and to insert the word 'section.'"

> "In page 11, line 21, after the word 'made,' to insert the words 'and allowed or signed.'"

> "In page 11, line 37, to leave out the words 'be repealed,' and to insert the words 'cease to have effect as respects income-tax charged for the year beginning the sixth day of April, nineteen hundred and seven, or for any subsequent year.'"—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Sir F. Banbury 637
Mr. Harmood-Banner 637

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

> "In page 11, line 38, to leave out Subsection (2) of Clause 25."—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Asquith 639
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 640
Mr. Samuel Roberts (*Sheffield, Ecclesall*) 640
Mr. Courthope 640

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 251 ; Noes, 54. (Division List No. 287.)

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 12, line 11, at end, to insert the words '(3) Where a profession, trade, or vocation is discontinued in any year, any person charged or chargeable with income-tax in respect of that profession, trade, or vocation shall be entitled to be charged on the actual amount of the profits or gains arising from the profession, trade, or vocation in that year, and shall also, if he proves to the satisfaction of the Commissioners, by whom the assessment has been or could have been made, that the total amount of the income-tax paid during the three previous years in respect of that profession, trade, or vocation exceeds the total amount which would have been paid if he had been assessed in each of those years on the actual amount of the profits or gains arising in respect of the profession, trade, or vocation, be entitled to repayment of the excess.'"—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

July 16.] *Page*

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Mr. William Rutherford (Liverpool, West Derby) 643
Mr. Courthope 644
Mr. Morton (Sutherland) 645

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment to the Bill—

"In line 1, after the word 'discontinued' to insert the words 'or the income derived therefrom is diminished.'"—(*Mr. Courthope.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment to the Bill."

Mr. Sydney Buxton 645
Mr. Samuel Roberts 647
Mr. Asquith 647
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 647

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Proposed words there inserted in the Bill.

The following Amendments were also agreed to—

"In page 13, line 12, after the word 'the,' to insert the word 'expression.'"

"In page 13, line 25, to leave out from the beginning to the word 'clergyman,' in line 26, and to insert the words 'Where a.'"

"In page 13, lines 26 and 27, to leave out the words 'religion who shall,' and to insert the words 'any religious denomination pays.'"

"In page 13, line 27, after the word 'rent,' to insert the word 'for.'"

'In page 13, line 27, to leave out from the word 'dwelling-house,' to the word 'mainly,' in line 28, and to insert 'and uses any part thereof.'"

"In page 13, line 28, to leave out from the word 'of,' to the end, and to insert the words 'his duty or function as such clergyman or minister, such part of the rent of the dwelling-house, not exceeding one-eighth, as the Commissioners by whom any assessment for income-tax is made may allow, shall be treated for the purposes of section fifty-two of The Income Tax Act, 1853, as expenses to which the provisions of that section as to deduction and repayment apply.'"—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Bill to be read a third time upon Monday next.

Leeds (South Parade Chapel) Charity Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 648

Kingswood (Whitefield Tabernacle, Schoolroom, Etc.) Charity Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 648

Married Women's Property Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 648

Petty Sessions Clerks (Ireland) Bill.—As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered, read the third time, and passed 648

And, it being after half-past Eleven of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at nine minutes before Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: WEDNESDAY, 17TH JULY, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with :—London County Council (General Powers) Bill.

The same was ordered to lie on the Table 649

London County Council (General Powers) Bill.—Examiner's Certificate of non-tompliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Tuesday next 649

Central London Railway Bill.—Reported, without Amendment 649

Penrith Urban District Council Bill.—Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons .. 649

Killery's Divorce Bill [H.L.].—Minutes of Evidence and proceedings before this House on the Second Reading, together with the documents deposited in the case, returned from the Commons 649

Barry Railway Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, that the Lord Oriel (*V. Massereene*) be proposed to the House as a Member of the Select Committee on the said Bill in the place of the Lord Lyveden; read, agreed to 649

Leeds (South Parade Chapel) Charity Bill (No. 116); Kingswood (Whitfield Tabernacle Schoolroom, etc.) Charity Bill (No. 117); Married Women's Property Bill (No. 118).—Brought from the Commons. Read 1^{a}, and to be printed 649

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill.
Moved, That the Order made on the 20th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 18th day of June next," be dispensed with.—(*Lord Denman.*)

July 17.] Page

On Question, Motion agreed to.

The Chairman of Committees (The Earl of Onslow) 650

Moved, " That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]—House in Committee (according to Order). The Amendments proposed by the Committees made. Standing Committee negatived.

The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow 650

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOILER EXPLOSIONS.—Report to the Secretary of the Board of Trade upon the working of the Boiler Explosions Acts, 1882 and 1890, with appendices. (In continuation of Parliamentary Paper [Cd. 3137]) 650

NAVY.—Returns of the number of courts-martial held, and summary punishments inflicted on seamen of the Royal Navy, etc., during the year 1906. Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 650

NAVY (PAY).—List of exceptions to the King's Regulations as to pay, non-effective pay, and allowances sanctioned by the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, with the approval of the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury during the year 1906–1907. Laid before the House (pursuant to Order in Council, dated 19th December, 1881). and ordered to lie on the Table .. 650

Petty Sessions Clerks (Ireland) Bill (No. 119).—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª, and to be printed.

THE TERRITORIAL ARMY.

The Earl of Donoughmore 651
The Under-Secretary of State for War (The Earl of Portsmouth) .. 651
The Marquess of Salisbury 652
Earl Bathurst 653
Lord Lovat 653

Moved, " That an humble address be presented to His Majesty for Papers regarding the strength, composition, and training of the mobile force for Home defence."—(*Lord Lovat.*)

The Earl of Portsmouth 655
Lord Newton 656
The Marquess of Lansdowne 657

Motion, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

TRAINING OF DIVISIONAL CAVALRY.

Viscount Hampden 658
The Earl of Portsmouth 659

Advertisements Regulation Bill; British North America Bill.—Amendments reported (according to Order); and Bills to be read 3^a To-morrow .. 660

House adjourned at ten minutes past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 17TH JULY, 1907.

The House met at quarter before Three of the Clock.

New Writ for the County of Wicklow (East Wicklow Division), in the room of Denis Joseph Cogan, esquire (Chiltern Hundreds).—(*Captain Donelan.*)

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

City of London (Union of Parishes) Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time, and committed 660

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill.—Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to 660

Portobello and Musselburgh Tramways (Levenhall Extension) Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed without Amendment 660

Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill.—Considered; to be read the third time upon Friday 661

North British Railway Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 661

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to London and North Western Railway Bill; Worthing Gas Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to: Devonport Corporation Bill [Lords]; Tees Valley Water (Consolidation) Bill [Lords]; Kendal Corporation Bill [Lords] without Amendment 661

PETITIONS.

SMALL LANDHOLDERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions against: From Easter Ross; Edinburgh; Inverness; and, Teviotdale; to lie upon the Table .. 661

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CROWN LANDS ACT, 1906.—Paper [presented 16th July] to be printed. [No. 253] 661

NAVY (COURTS MARTIAL).—Copy presented, of Return of the Number of Courts Martial held and Summary Punishments inflicted during the year 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 661

NAVY (EXCEPTIONS TO KING'S REGULATIONS).—Copy presented, of List of Exceptions to the King's Regulations as to Pay, Non-effective Pay, and Allowances during year 1906–7 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 661

July 17.] *Page*

PUBLIC INCOME AND EXPENDITURE.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 11th July: Sir Henry Fowler]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 254] 662

TREATY SERIES (No. 20, 1907).—Copy presented, of Accession of Cuba Dominican Republic, Hayti, and Paraguay to the Convention, signed at Geneva, 22nd August, 1864, for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded in Armies in the Field, 6th July, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 662

SUGAR CONVENTION (No. 7, 1907).—Copy presented, of Report of Proceedings of the International Sugar Commission, Spring Session, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 662

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report Annual Series, No. 3859 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 662

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Inquiry into Charities (County of Wilts).—Further Return relative thereto [ordered 9th August, 1901: Mr. Griffith-Boscawen] to be printed. [No. 255] .. 662

PAUPERS AND DEPENDANTS (SCOTLAND).—Return ordered, "showing the number of all ordinary Poor and their Dependants chargeable to Parish Councils in Scotland during the year ended the 15th day of May, 1907, including poor relieved whose Settlements were undetermined at the 15th day of May, 1907, classified in the following forms:—

(1) Aggregate period of chargeability and number of times relieved, distinguishing (*a*) persons relieved wholly in institutions; (*b*) persons relieved wholly outside institutions; (*c*) other persons relieved; and also distinguishing in the case of each of these classes (1) male adults; (2) female adults; (3) children 662

Aggregate period of chargeability of individual paupers during the year.	Paupers.						Dependants.					
	Number of times chargeable during the year.						Number of times chargeable during the year.					
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5 or more.	Total.	1.	2.	3.	4.	5 or more.	Total.
Not exceeding one week												
Over 1 week and not exceeding 4 weeks												
Over 4 weeks and not exceeding 13 weeks												
Over 13 weeks and not exceeding 26 weeks												
Over 26 weeks and not exceeding 39 weeks												
Over 39 weeks, but less than one year												
Whole year												
Total												

(2) Ages, and sex, distinguishing (*a*) persons relieved singly; (*b*) families—(1) heads of families, (2) dependants.

Age Groups.	Males.	Females.
Under 3 years		
3 years and under 14 years		
14 years and under 16 years		
16 years and under 20 years		
20 years and under 25 years		
25 years and under 35 years		
35 years and under 45 years		
45 years and under 55 years		
55 years and under 60 years		
60 years and under 65 years		
65 years and under 75 years		
75 years and upwards		
Total		

TRUSTEES SAVINGS BANKS.—Return ordered, "(1) From each Savings Bank in England and Wales, Scotland, Ireland, and the Channel Islands, containing, in columns, the names of the Officers, their respective salaries, and other allowances, if any; the amount of security each gives; the annual expenses of management, inclusive of all payments and salaries, for the year ended the 20th day of November, 1906; the rate per centum per annum on the capital of the Bank for the expenses of management; the rate of interest paid to depositors on the various amounts of deposit, and the average rate of interest on all accounts; the number of accounts remaining open; the total amount owing to depositors; the total amount invested with the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt; the balance in the hands of the Treasurer at the 20th day of November, 1906; the total amount of the separate Surplus Fund on the 20th day of November, 1906; other assets, including estimated value of Bank premises, furniture, etc.; the total assets; the total amount of Government Stock standing to the credit of depositors; the number and amount of annuities granted; and the average cost of each transaction; also the year in which business commenced in each Bank, and the name of the day or days, and the number of hours in the week, on which the Banks are open for the deposit and withdrawal of moneys; including in such Return a list of all such Savings Banks, as under the provisions of the Act 26 Vict., c. 14, or otherwise, have been closed and have transferred their funds, or any part thereof, to the Post Office Savings Bank; showing, in each case, the number of such Banks, as well as the number and amount of depositor's accounts so transferred, and the amount of compensation, if any, made to all or any of the Officers of such Banks respectively; and showing also the years in which such Banks were respectively opened and closed, and the number and amount of their Depositor's balances, and the number of days and hours in each week on which the same Banks were open for public business at the close of the year next preceding the date of such closing; distinguishing the same, as in the Return, for each separate county, as well as collectively, for England and Wales, Scotland, Ireland, and the Channel Islands, and for the United Kingdom; and (2) for the year ending the 20th day of November, 1906,

July 17.] Page

showing the total number of depositors in Trustee Savings Banks ; the total number of deposits ; the average amount of each deposit account ; the average sums paid in and drawn out ; the total number of persons who have deposited in single sums the entire amount allowed to be deposited during the year (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 286, of Session 1906)."—(*Sir Frederick Banbury*) 664

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

FATAL ACCIDENTS.—Question, Mr. Laidlaw (Renfrewshire, E.) ; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 666

NAVY-DISTINGUISHING BADGE FOR ELECTRICIANS.—Question, Mr. Alden (Middlesex, Tottenham) ; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 666

MEETINGS OF COMMISSIONERS FOR CHARITABLE DONATIONS AND BEQUESTS (IRELAND).—Question, Mr. J. Devlin (Belfast, W.) ; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 667

AYRSHIRE FOUNDRY COMPANY AND THE ADMIRALTY.—Question, Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.) ; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 667

TOBACCO REVENUE.—Question, Mr. Lea ; Answer, Mr. Asquith 668

LOANS TO SELF-GOVERNING COLONIES.—Question, Mr. Walrond (Devonshire, Tiverton) ; Answer, Mr. Asquith 668

SALE OF IRISH ESTATES—OFFERS REFUSED.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N.) ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 668

ALLOCATION OF ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.—Question, Mr. O'Shee (Waterford, W.) ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 671

IRISH SCHOOLS—ANNUAL INSPECTIONS.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.) ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 672

INSURANCE OF IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. Sloan ; Answer, Mr. Runciman 673

APPOINTMENT OF DISTRICT INSPECTOR O'SHEE AS ADJUTANT OF ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.—Question, Mr. Sloan ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 673

BRITISH MUSEUM LITERARY SECTION.—Question, Mr. Ginnell ; Answer, Mr. Runciman 674

SCOTTISH FIRMS AND ADMIRALTY CLOTHING CONTRACTS.—Question, Mr. Watt (Glasgow College) ; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 675

HOURS AND PAY OF DUBLIN OUTDOOR DOCKET TELEGRAPH MESSENGERS.—Question, Mr. J. P. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green) ; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 675

PREFERENCE FOR TELEPHONE CALLS OVER TELEGRAMS AT BRISTOL.—Question, Mr. W. T. Wilson (Lancashire, Westhoughton) ; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 676

SCHOOLMASTERS IN COUNTY OF DURHAM HOLDING OTHER OFFICES.—Question, Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland); Answer, Mr. McKenna 678

LOANS TO SELF-GOVERNING COLONIES.—Question, Mr. Walrond; Answer, Mr. Asquith 678

INQUIRY INTO CASE OF EITAL PRÆSAD, INSPECTOR OF POLICE IN BENGAL.—Question, Mr. Herbert (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe); Answer, Mr. Morley 678

SCOTCH FIRMS AND ARMY CLOTHING CONTRACTS.—Question, Mr. Watt; Answer, Mr. Haldane 679

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

THE EMPIRE AND THE FLAG.—Question, Mr. Mitchell Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.), Mr. Rees; Answers, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) 680

NEW ROYAL YACHT.—Question, Mr. Watt (Glasgow College); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 680

NAVAL DRILLS.—Question, Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 681

H.M.S. "SCYLLA."—Question, Mr. Mitchell Thomson; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 681

RAILWAY FARES FOR VOLUNTEER OFFICERS.—Question, Mr. Starkey (Nottinghamshire, Newark); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) 681

THE ARTILLERY.—Question, Mr. Leverton Harris (Tower Hamlets, Stepney); Answer, Mr. Haldane 682

NATIVE RESERVATIONS IN EAST AFRICA.—Questions, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland), Mr. Myer (Lambeth, N.), Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool); Answers, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 682

EAST INDIANS AT TRINIDAD.—Questions, Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland), Mr. Rees; Answer, Mr. Churchill 684

TRINIDAD RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.—Question, Mr. Summerbell; Answer, Mr. Churchill 685

WINNIPEG UNEMPLOYED.—Question, Mr. Clynes (Manchester, N.E.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 685

BRITISH TROOPS IN JOHANNESBURG.—Question, Mr. Mond (Chester); Answer, Mr. Churchill 686

LABOUR IN THE TRANSVAAL MINES.—Question, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; Answer, Mr. Churchill 686

NEW HEBRIDES PUNITIVE EXPEDITION.—Question, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; Answer, Mr. Churchill 687

July 17.] Page

TEA DUTY.—Question, Mr. Leverton Harris; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) 687

DARTMOOR CONVICTS—TREATMENT OF RECAPTURED PRISONERS.—Questions, Mr. Hazleton (Galway, N.), Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.), Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.), Mr. Swift MacNeill, Mr. John Redmond (Waterford); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 687

CHESTER VACCINATION PROSECUTION.—Questions, Mr. Mond, Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford); Answers, Mr. Gladstone 690

IMPORTATION OF TRACHOMA.—Question, Mr. Leverton Harris; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 691

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS' FEES.—Question, Mr. J. D. White (Dumbartonshire); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 691

POST OFFICE CONTRACTS.—Question, Mr. Clynes; Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 692

LOW VALLEY ROMAN CATHOLIC SCHOOL.—Questions, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.), Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) 692

MERIONETH SCHOOL TEACHERS' SALARIES.—Question, Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.); Answer, Mr. McKenna 693

LLANDWROG SCHOOL.—Question, Lord R. Cecil; Answer, Mr. McKenna .. 693

SCOTTISH APPEALS.—Question, Mr. Watt; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. Thomas Shaw, Hawick Burghs) 693

CRANNAGH FARM.—Question, Mr. Sheehan (Cork County, Mid.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 694

IRISH INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION.—Question, Mr. John Redmond; Answer, Mr. Birrell 694

ADMINISTRATION OF THE LABOURERS ACT.—Question, Mr. Sheehan; Answer, Mr. Birrell 695

IRISH TRADE STATISTICS.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 696

EVICTED TENANTS AND FAIR RENTS.—Question, Mr. Hugh Law (Donegal, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 697

DRAINAGE OF THE BARROW.—Question, Mr. Meehan (Queen's County, Leix); Answer, Mr. Birrell 697

IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUDITORS.—Questions, Mr. Meehan, Mr. Kilbride; Answers, Mr. Birrell 698

IRISH PRISON WARDERS' SALARIES.—Question, Mr. Meehan; Answer, Mr. Birrell 699

LAND COMMISSION'S ASSISTANT CLERKSHIPS.—Questions, Mr. Meehan, Mr. Kilbride; Answers, Mr. Birrell 700

TANDRAGEE EVICTED TENANT.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 701

IRISH DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell 702

CATTLE DRIVING IN THE WEST OF IRELAND.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Swift MacNeill, Mr. Kilbride, Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.); Answers, Mr. Birrell 702

IRISH TEACHERS' SALARIES.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 703

IRISH SCHOOL INSPECTIONS.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 704

RULES OF THE IRISH COMMISSIONERS OF NATIONAL EDUCATION.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Birrell 704

AGRARIAN TRIALS AT ROSCOMMON ASSIZES.—Question, Mr. James Campbell (Dublin University); Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool, Exchange) 705

MR. GINNELL, M.P. AND THE GRASS FARM AGITATION.—Questions, Mr. Charles Craig, Mr. Moore; Answers, Mr. Birrell, Mr. Speaker 706

DESTRUCTIVE INSECTS AND PESTS ACT.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Cherry (for Mr. T. W. Russell) 706

KING'S COUNTY ASSIZE TRIALS—PRESS COMMENTS.—Question, Mr. Haviland Burke (King's County, Tullamore); Answer, Mr. Cherry 707

SWINE FEVER IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, The Treasurer of the Household (Sir Edward Strachey, Somersetshire, S.) 708

IRISH BUTTER DELIVERY DELAYS.—Question, Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 709

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C: Sir Howard Vincent; and had appointed in substitution: Captain Hervey.

Report to lie upon the Table 710

Merchant Shipping (Tonnage Deduction for Propelling Power) Bill.

Reported with Amendments, from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence.

Special Report brought up, and read.

Report and Special Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 256].

Bill, as amended, re-committed, to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 281] 710

NEW BILL.

WASTE LANDS (IRELAND) IMPROVEMENT.

Dr. Ambrose (Mayo, W.) 710

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to enable county councils in Ireland to acquire and improve and sell or let waste land; and for other purposes."—(*Dr. Ambrose.*)

Mr. Moore (Armagh, N.) 711

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Dr. Ambrose, Mr. Gwynn, Mr. William Redmond, Mr. Meagher, Mr. Lundon, Mr. MacNeill, Mr. Crean, Mr. John Roche, Mr. Duffy, Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. O'Malley, and Mr. M'Hugh.

Waste Lands (Ireland) Improvement Bill.—"To enable county councils in Ireland to acquire and improve and sell or let waste land; and for other purposes," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 282].

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Mr. Moore (Armagh, N.) 712

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Moore.*)

The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 713
Mr. Walter Long (Dublin, S.) 713
Mr. James Campbell (Dublin University) 714

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 46; Noes, 247. (Division List No. 288).

Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool) 717

Mr. James Campbell 726

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 6, after the word 'any,' to insert the word 'untenanted.'"—(*Mr.. Campbell.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'untenanted' to be there inserted."

Mr. Birrell 726
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 730
Mr. John Redmond (Waterford) 732
Mr. Moore 736
Colonel Kenyon-Slaney (Shropshire, Newport) 739
Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.) 741
Mr. Butcher (Cambridge, University) 742
The Attorney-General for Scotland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool, Exchange) .. 744
Mr. Walter Long 746
Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.) 748
Mr. Wyndham (Dover) 751
Mr. Ashley 752
Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham) 754
Mr. James Campbell 756
Mr. Birrell 757
Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 758
Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.) 761

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 66 ; Noes, 257. (Division List, No. 289.)

Mr. J. F. Mason (Windsor) 769
Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool) 769

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 1, line 7, to leave out the word 'compulsorily.'"—(*Mr. Ashley*).

Question proposed, "That the word 'compulsorily' stand part of the clause."

Mr. Cherry 774
Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, E.) 775
Mr. James Campbell 777
Mr. Birrell 785
Mr. Moore 788
Mr. Barrie 790
Mr. J. F. Mason 792
Sir F. Banbury 792
Colonel Kenyon-Slaney 794
Mr. Charles Craig 796
Mr. Walter Long 799
Mr. T. M. Healy 803
Mr. A. J. Balfour 805
Mr. Birrell 806

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 225 ; Noes, 69. (Division List No. 290.)

And, it being after Eleven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report progress ; to sit again upon Monday next.

Adjourned at twelve minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 18TH JULY, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with :—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) ; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) ; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12).

Also the Certificate that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill :—Local Government Provisional Order (No. 15).

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 809

Portobello and Musselburgh Tramways (Levenhall Extension) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to .. 809

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 809

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.].—Amendments reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3ª on Monday next .. 809

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COLONIES : ANNUAL.

No. 528. Bermuda (Report for 1906) 809

BRUNEI.—Report on the State of Brunei for 1906 809

TREATY SERIES, No. 20 (1907).—Accession of Cuba, Dominican Republic, Hayti, and Paraguay to the Convention signed at Geneva, 22nd August, 1864, for the amelioration of the condition of the wounded in armies in the field, 6th July, 1907 809

COMMERCIAL, No. 7 (1907).—International Sugar Commission, Spring Session, 1907. Report of Proceedings (in continuation of Commercial, No. 1 (1907)) 810

TRADE REPORTS : ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3859. Austria-Hungary (Trieste).

No. 3860. China (Teng Yuch).

No. 3861. Japan (Shimonoseki).

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 810

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL PARCEL POST, PERU).—The Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 8) Warrant, 1907, dated 29th June, 1907. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 810

July 18.] *Page*

Fiji.—Return giving correspondence between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Government of Fiji, respecting the sale of certain lands in the Provinces of Rewa and Naitasiri. Presented (pursuant to order of Tuesday last), and to be printed. (No. 120) 810

Companies (Consolidation) Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to consolidate the Companies Act, 1862, and the Acts amending it—Was presented by the Lord Granard (*E. Granard*) ; read 1^{a} ; to be printed ; and to be read 2^{a} on Tuesday next. (No. 121) 810

Injured Animals Act (1894) Amendment Bill.—[Second Reading].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Aberdare 810

Moved, " That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*Lord Aberdare.*)

Earl Beauchamp 811

On Question, Bill read 2^{a} and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill.—Report of Amendments received.

The Under-Secretary of State for War (*The Earl of Portsmouth*) 811

Amendment moved—

" In page 3, line 13, to leave out from the word ' Parliament ' to the end of Subsection (5)."—(*The Earl of Portsmouth.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Earl Fortescue 811

Amendment moved—

" In page 3, line 29, after the word ' volunteers ' to insert the following new subsection : ' (7) The chairman of the association may receive such remuneration as the association think reasonable.' "—(*Earl Fortescue.*)

The Earl of Portsmouth 813

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Viscount Esher 813

Amendment moved—

" In page 4, line 23, after the word ' clubs ' to insert the words ' provided that no financial assistance out of money voted by Parliament shall be given by an association in respect of any person in a battalion or corps in a school in receipt of a Parliamentary grant until such person has attained the age of sixteen.' "—(*Viscount Esher.*)

July 18.] *Page*

The Earl of Meath 815
Earl Roberts 820
Lord Newton 821
The Marquess of Lansdowne 821
The Lord President of the Council (*The Earl of Crewe*) 823

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Viscount Midleton 824

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 26, before the word 'the' to insert the words 'providing accommodation for.'"—(*Viscount Midleton.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Viscount Midleton 824

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 30, after the word 'locally' to insert the words 'such requirements, where practicable, to be embodied in regulations.'" —(*Viscount Midleton.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Blythswood 825

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 29, after the word 'Treasury' to insert the following new subsection :—'(7) The members of an association shall not be under any pecuniary liability for any act done by them in their capacity as members of such association in carrying out the provisions of this Act."—(*Lord Blythswood.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Earl Fortescue 826

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 33, after the word 'made' to insert the following new subsection :—'(4) —(*a*) Any county associations may from time to time join in appointing out of their respective bodies a joint committee for any purpose in respect of which they are jointly interested; (*b*) Any association appointing a joint committee under this subsection may delegate to it any power which such association might exercise for the purpose for which the committee is appointed; (*c*) Subject to the terms of delegation any such joint committee shall in respect of any matter delegated to it have the same power in all respects as the associations appointing it; (*d*) The costs of a joint committee shall be defrayed by the associations by whom it has been appointed, in such proportion as may be agreed between them, and the accounts of such

joint committees and their officers shall for the purposes of the provisions of this Act be deemed to be accounts of the associations appointing them and of their officers.' "—(*Earl Fortescue.*)

The Earl of Portsmouth 827

On Question, Amendment agreed to, and new clause added to the Bill.

The Earl of Portsmouth 827

Amendment moved—

"In page 7, line 18, to leave out the word 'shall' and to insert the word 'may.' "—(*The Earl of Portsmouth.*)

The Earl of Erroll 828
The Marquess of Salisbury 829
Lord Ribblesdale 830
Lord Zouche of Haryngworth 830
Lord Montagu of Beaulieu 831
The Duke of Northumberland 831
Lord Lucas 832
Earl Brownlow 833
Lord Lovat 834
The Earl of Donoughmore 835
The Earl of Mount Edgcumbe 836
Earl Roberts 836
The Earl of Crewe 837
The Marquess of Lansdowne 838

On Question, "That the word 'shall' stand part of the clause,'" their Lordships divided:—Contents, 108; Not-contents, 38.

The Marquess of Lansdowne 841

Amendment moved—

"In page 7, line 18, after the word 'shall' to insert the words 'except in special circumstances certified by the general officer commanding.' "—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Dundonald 843

Amendment moved—

"In page 8, line 23, after the word 'county' to insert the words 'after consultation with the officers commanding the brigade to which the unit belongs.' "—(*The Earl of Dundonald.*)

The Earl of Portsmouth 843

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

July 18.] Page

The Duke of Bedford 844

Amendment moved—

"In page 9, line 4, after the word 'time' to insert the following new subsection: '(*d*) Shall be warned before attestation that he may be asked to serve outside the United Kingdom in time of national emergency, and his attestation paper shall contain a certificate that the attesting officer has explained the same to the recruit.'"—(*The Duke of Bedford.*)

The Earl of Portsmouth 844
The Duke of Northumberland 845
The Earl of Crewe 845
The Earl of Donoughmore 846
Lord Raglan 847

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Earl Fortescue 848

Amendment moved—

"In page 14, line 38, after the word 'force' to insert the following new subsection:—'(4) It shall be lawful when the Territorial Force or any part of it is embodied, to billet the officers, men, and horses belonging to it on other premises than those licensed for the sale of intoxicating liquors.'"—(*Earl Fortescue.*)

Lord Lovat 849
The Earl of Portsmouth 849
The Marquess of Salisbury 850
Lord Raglan 850
The Lord Chancellor 850

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The Duke of Bedford 851

Amendment moved—

"In page 14, line 38, after the word 'Force' to insert the following new subsection:—'(4) It shall be lawful for a Secretary of State at any time when occasion appears to require to call out any portion or any of the men belonging to the Territorial Army to aid the civil power in the preservation of peace.'"—(*The Duke of Bedford.*)

The Earl of Portsmouth 851
The Earl of Scarbrough 852
The Lord Chancellor 852

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Lord Montagu of Beaulieu 853

Amendment moved—

"In page 17, line 11, after the word 'jury' to insert the words 'and field officers of the Territorial Army shall not be required to serve in the office of high sheriff.'"—(*Lord Montagu of Beaulieu.*)

The Earl of Crewe 853

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Portsmouth 853

Amendment moved—

"In page 20, line 7, after the word 'Volunteers,' to insert the words, 'and every such Order in Council shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament.'"—(*The Earl of Portsmouth.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Portsmouth 854

Amendment moved—

"In page 21, line 20, to leave out Paragraph (f)."—(*The Earl of Portsmouth.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Portsmouth 854

Amendment moved—

"In page 21, lines 29 and 30, to leave out the words 'as soon as may be after it is made.'"—(*The Earl of Portsmouth.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Duke of Bedford 854

Amendment moved—

"In page 21, at the beginning of line 33, to insert as a new subsection:—'(1) The application of the provisions of Part III. of this Act to the Militia shall be deferred for a period of two years.'"—(*The Duke of Bedford.*)

Viscount Hardinge 861
Viscount Midleton 865
The Earl of Portsmouth 870
Earl Bathurst 873
Lord Abinger 875
The Marquess of Salisbury 876
Lord Raglan 879
Earl Cawdor 883
The Earl of Crewe 884

July 18.] Page

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Earl Bathurst 885

Amendment moved—

"In page 22, line 11, after the word 'training' to insert the words 'which shall include musketry training.'"—(*Earl Bathurst.*)

The Earl of Portsmouth 886
The Marquess of Salisbury 886
Lord Raglan 888

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment moved—

"In page 22, line 25, after the word 'effect' to insert the following new sub-section:—'(5) A special reservist who enlists into the Regular Forces shall upon such enlistment be deemed to be discharged from the Army Reserve.'"—(*The Earl of Portsmouth.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 24, line 9, to leave out the word 'Act, 1882,' and to insert the words 'Acts 1882 to 1906.'"—(*The Earl of Portsmouth.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Marquess of Salisbury 889

Amendment moved—

"In line 11, to leave out the word 'if,' and to insert the word 'unless,' In line 12, to leave out the words from 'transfer' to the end of the line, and to insert the words 'indicates his consent to such transfer certified by the commanding officer.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In line 13, after the word 'service' to insert the following new sub-section: '(3) All Orders in Council made under this section shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament.'"—(*The Earl of Portsmouth.*)

Viscount Midleton 890
The Earl of Crewe 890

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendments moved—

"In page 24, line 25, after the word 'council' to insert the words 'or scheme.'"

"In page 24, line 31, to leave out the words 'on which the said House shall have sat.'"

"In page 24, line 32, to leave the words 'rule or order,' and to insert the words 'order or scheme.'"

"In page 24, line 33, after the word 'order' to insert the words 'or scheme.'"—(*The Earl of Portsmouth.*)

On Question, Amendments agreed to.

The Earl of Jersey 891

Amendment moved—

"In page 25, line 29, after the word 'Southampton' to insert the following new sub-section: '(5) Nothing of this Act shall affect the raising and levying of the Trophy Tax as heretofore in the City of London, but the proceeds of the tax so levied may be applied by His Majesty's Commissioners of Lieutenancy for the City of London, if the Royal London Militia Battalion is reconstituted as a battalion of the Army Reserve, for any purposes connected with that battalion, and may also, if His Majesty's Commissioners of Lieutenancy for the City of London in their discretion see fit, be applied for the purposes of any of the powers and duties of the association of the City of London under this Act.'"

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill to be read 3^a on Tuesday next, and to be printed as amended. (No. 122.)

Limited Partnerships Bill.—Read 3^a (according to Order) with the Amendments; and passed, and returned to the Commons 892

British North America Bill.—Read 3^a (according to Order) with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 892

House adjourned at ten minutes past Eleven o'clock, to Monday next, half-past Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 18TH JULY, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the

July 18.] *Page*

Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.: —Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 1) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow 893

Ashton-under-Lyne, Stalybridge, and Dunkinfield (District) Waterworks Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 893

Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [Lords] (King's Consent Signified).—Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 893

Sheffield Corporation Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; a clause added; Bill to be read the third time 893

York (Micklegate Strays) Bill [Lords] (by Order).—Read a second time, and committed 893

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow 893

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 2) Bill [Lords].—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow 893

Selsey Water Bill [Lords]; **Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill** [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 893

Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill [Lords].—Reported, with an Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 895

Electric Supply Corporation Bill [Lords].—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Bill to be read the third time 893

Alton Military Hospital Bill [Lords].—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time 894

Pasley Children Legitimisation Bill [Lords], reported, with an Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table 894

Message from the Lords.—That they have agreed to Penrith Urban District Council Bill, with Amendments 894

PETITIONS.

Congo Free State.—Petition from Manchester, for protection of the Native Races ; to lie upon the Table 894

Land Values (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Perth, against ; to lie upon the Table 894

Weekly Rest-Day Bill.—Petition from Kilburn and other places, in favour ; to lie upon the Table 894

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Joint Stock Companies.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 12th June ; [*Mr. Lloyd-George*] ; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 257] 894

County Courts (Plaints and Sittings).—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 9th July ; *Mr. Herbert Samuel*] ; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 258] 894

Post Office (Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post).—Copy presented, of the Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 8) Warrant, 1907, dated 29th June, 1917 [by Act] ; to lie upon the Table 894

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3860 and 3861 [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table 894

Brunei.—Copy presented, of Report on the State of Brunei for 1906 [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table 895

Colonial Reports (Annual).—Copy presented, of Report, No. 528 (Bermuda, Annual Report for 1906) [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table 895

Naval Prize Money.—Account presented, showing the Receipt and Expenditure of Naval Prize, Bounty, Salvage, and other Moneys between the 1st April, 1906, and 31st March, 1907 [by Act] ; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 259] 895

Paper Laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House.—Caledonian Canal, Copy of One hundred and second Report of the Commissioners [by Act] ; to be printed. [No. 260] 895

Harbour Etc., Bills.—Copy ordered, " of the Report of the Board of Trade on the Birkenhead Corporation Water Bill [Lords]."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George*) .. 895

Civil Servants (Retirement at the Age of Sixty-Five).—Copy ordered, " of Treasury Minute, dated the 17th day of July, 1907, stating the circumstances under which certain Civil Servants have been retained in the Service after they have attained the age of sixty-five ; and of the Return therein referred to."—(*Mr. Runciman*) 895

July 18.] Page

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

KENMARE RURAL POSTMEN.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 895

BIRMINGHAM TELEGRAPH STAFF.—Question, Mr. T. F. Richards (Wolverhampton, W.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 896

BOY CLERKS.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Runciman 896

FOREIGN WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.—Question, Mr. Brigg (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley); Answer, Sir E. Grey 896

CRIME IN CEYLON.—Question, Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 897

ST. HELENA PRISONERS.—Question, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester); Answer, Mr. Churchill 897

COLONIAL AUDITS.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Runciman 898

GOVERNMENT PENSIONERS.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Mr. Runciman 898

INFANTILE MORTALITY.—Question, Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland); Answer, Mr. John Burns 899

METROPOLITAN GUARDIANS ACCOUNT AUDITS.—Question Mr. Stuart Samuel (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel); Answer, Mr. John Burns 899

BELFAST TELEGRAPH CLERKS.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 900

BOY TELEGRAPH MESSENGERS.—Question, Mr. Kendal O'Brien (Tipperary, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 900

SUB-POSTMASTER'S LETTER BOXES.—Question, Mr. W. T. Wilson (Lancashire, Westhoughton); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 901

TELEGRAPH VACANCIES AT DERBY.—Question, Mr. Bell (Derby); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 901

AMERICAN GOOSEBERRY MILDEW.—Question, Mr. Beck (Cambridgeshire, Wisbech); Answer, Sir E. Strachey 902

ROYAL COURTS OF JUSTICE.—Question, Mr. Herbert (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe; Answer, Mr. Harcourt) 902

BOMBAY SIND RAILWAY.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Morley 902

INDIA PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.—Question, Sir Seymour King (Hull, Central); Answer, Mr. Morley 903

Page

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY AT NEWRY.—Question, Captain Craig (Down, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 903

IRISH TENANTS AS CARETAKERS.—Question, Mr. Walter Long (Dublin, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 904

SIR ROBERT HUDSON'S CAVAN TENANTRY.—Question, Mr. Samuel Young (Cavan, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 905

HOLYROOD URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL.—Question, Mr. J. Devlin (Belfast, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 905

ARMY MEAT TENDERS.—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton (Canterbury); Answer, Mr. Haldane 906

AFFORESTRY IN THE FOREST OF DEAN.—Question, Mr. Munro Ferguson (Leith Burghs); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 907

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

PORTSMOUTH DOCKYARD DISCHARGES.—Question, Mr. Staveley-Hill (Staffordshire, Kingswinford); Answer, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Lambert, Devonshire, South Molton) 907

DOCKYARD DISCHARGES.—Question, Mr. Staveley-Hill; Answer, Mr. Lambert 907

NAVAL AND MARINE PENSIONS.—Question, Mr. Kelley (Manchester, S.W.); Answer, Mr. Lambert 908

SUBMARINES.—Question, Mr. George Faber (York); Answer, Mr. Lambert .. 908

THE CHANNEL FLEET.—Question, Mr. George Faber; Answer, Mr. Lambert .. 909

SMOKELESS BLANK CARTRIDGE.—Question, Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) .. 910

MILITARY OFFICERS IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 910

TREATMENT OF ZULU PRISONERS AT ST. HELENA.—Questions, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester), Mr. Byles (Salford, N.); Answers The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 911

FIGHTING IN THE NEW HEBRIDES.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray (St. Andrews Burghs); Answer, Mr. Churchill 913

IMPORT OF ARMS AND SPIRITS INTO THE NEW HEBRIDES.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answer, Mr. Churchill 913

CONCESSIONS IN CHINA.—Question, Mr. C. E. Price (Edinburgh, Central); Answer, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir E. Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) 913

EGYPTIAN POSTAGE.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside); Answer, Sir E. Grey 914

July 18.] *Page*

Galapagos Island.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray; Answer, Sir E. Grey 914

Egyptian Educational Service.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson; Answer, Sir E. Grey 915

Newfoundland Fisheries.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.), Sir Gilbert Parker; Answers, Sir E. Grey 915

Assault on a British Telegraphist at Odessa.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray; Answer, Sir E. Grey 916

San Thomé and Principé.—Question, Mr. Arkwright (Hereford); Answer, Sir E. Grey 916

Income-tax.—Question, Mr. Evelyn Cecil (Aston Manor); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fife, E.) 916

Savings Banks Balance Sheets.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Asquith 917

Trustee Savings Banks.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Asquith 918

Police Persecution of Ex-Convicts.—Question, Mr. Thorne (West Ham, S.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 919

Factory Inspection.—Question, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 919

Medical Officers of Health and Factory Inspection.—Question, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 920

Inspections of Outworkers.—Question, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 920

Sunderland Hair Dressers' Closing Order.—Question, Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 922

Aged Workmen and the Workmen's Compensation Act.—Question, Mr. Summerbell; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 923

Brighton Unemployed Funds.—Question, Mr. Thorne; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) .. 923

Remission of Surcharges.—Question, Mr. E. Gardner (Berkshire, Wokingham); Answer, Mr. John Burns 924

Croydon Vaccination Case.—Question, Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford); Answer, Mr. John Burns 924

Secondary Education Code.—Question, Mr. Hicks Beach (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury); Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Mr. Lough, Islington, W.) 925

Clerks to Surveyors of Taxes.—Question, Mr. Power (Waterford, E.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) 92

Page

BELFAST TRADE DISPUTE.—Questions, Mr. Jowett (Bradford, W.), Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool, Exchange), Mr. Speaker 926

NAZARETH ROMAN CATHOLIC INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, BELFAST.—Questions, Captain Craig (Down, E.), Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.); Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 927

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Staveley Hill; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 928

RUAN DISTURBANCES.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell 928

NAVIGATION WORKS (IRELAND) BILL.—Question, Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 929

CREATION OF PEERS.—Questions, Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield), Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 929

RADIOTELEGRAPHIC REPORT.—Questions, Sir E. Sassoon (Hythe), Mr. Forster (Kent, Sevenoaks), Mr. Gwynn (Galway), Sir Gilbert Parker; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 930

SUGAR CONVENTION.—Question, Sir E. Sassoon; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 931

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Question, Mr. Akers Douglas (Kent, St. Augustine's); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 931

SUPPLY [17TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1907–8.

CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £123,735, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of His Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department and Subordinate Offices."

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 932
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 940
Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester) 951
Mr. Brace (Glamorganshire, S.) 959
Mr. H. J. Tennant (Berwickshire) 963
Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland) 969

July 18.] *Page*

Sir Samuel Scott (Marylebone, W.) 970
Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe) 971
The Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Herbert Samuel, Yorkshire, Cleveland) 975
Mr. Akers-Douglas (Kent. St. Augustine's) 981

And, it being a quarter-past Eight of the Clock, and there being Private Business set down by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

Midland Railway Bill [LORDS] (BY ORDER).—Order for the Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Morton (Sutherland) 985
Mr. Smeaton (Stirlingshire) 986
Mr. Seddon (Lancashire, Newton) 986
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (Mr. Kearley, Devonport) 986

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

Mr. Brunner (Lancashire, Leigh) 987
Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.) 989

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it be an instruction to the Committee to omit Clause 30 and any other references to the abandonment of a portion of the Cromford Canal."—(*Mr. Brunner.*)

Sir E. Boyle (Taunton) 990
Mr. Crossley (Cheshire, Altrincham) 991
Mr. Morton (Sutherland) 992
Mr. Kearley 993

Ordered, That, in the case of the Midland Railway Bill [Lords], Standing Orders 82, 211, 236, and 237 be suspended, and that the Committee of Selection have leave to appoint the Committee on the Bill to sit and proceed upon Wednesday next.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

SUPPLY—(CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES).

Postponed Proceeding on Question, "That a sum, not exceeding £128,735, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of His Majesty's Secretary of State of the Home Department and Subordinate Offices, resumed."

[Mr. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) in the Chair.]

Mr. Smeaton 994
Mr. Akers-Douglas 998
Mr. Gladstone 999
Mr. F. E. Smith (Liverpool, Walton) 1004
Mr. Gladstone 1016

And, it being Eleven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

Longton (Caroline Street Chapel) Charity Bill.—Read the third time and passed 1018

THE STRIKE AT BELFAST.

On the Motion for the adjournment of the House.

Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald 1018
The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 1018
Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.) 1019
Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.) 1020

Adjourned at fourteen minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 19TH JULY, 1907.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Bude Gas Bill; King's Norton and Northfield Urban District Council Bill.—Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to 1021

Killery's Divorce Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 1021

Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered. To be read the third time 1021

Tynemouth (Corporation) Water Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered. Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 1021

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 2) Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment .. 1021

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill.—As amended, considered. To be read the third time upon Monday next 1021

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 1) Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time, and committed 1021

July 19.] Page

PETITIONS.

GROCERS' LICENCES (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition of the Scottish Trade Protection Society; against; to lie upon the Table 1021

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions in favour: From Marylebone; and, Sydenham; to lie upon the Table 1021

NOTIFICATION OF BIRTHS BILL—Petition from Wandsworth, against; to lie upon the Table 1021

SMALL LANDOWNERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions against: From Fife; and, Grongar; to lie upon the Table 1022

Petition from Midlothian, for alteration; to lie upon the Table .. 1022

WEEKLY REST-DAY BILL. Petition from Harlesden and other places, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1022

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

HARBOUR, ETC., BILLS.—Return presented; relative thereto [ordered 18th July; Mr. *Lloyd-Gearge*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 261] 1022

CIVIL SERVANTS (RETIREMENT AT THE AGE OF SIXTY-FIVE).—Return presented; relative thereto [ordered 18th July; Mr. *Runciman*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 262] 1022

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1887.—Copy presented; of the Treasury Minute, 15th July, 1907, granting a Retired allowance to Mr. Harry Banks, Officer of Beeston Station, Second Class, Inland Revenue, under the Act [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1022

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

CHARGE OF DISTURBANCE AGAINST A ST. JOHN'S WOOD POSTMAN.—Question, Mr. Steadman (Finsbury, Central); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. 1023

PAYMENT OF INCOME-TAX BY BRITISH SUBJECTS SERVING ABROAD.—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Asquith 1023

Telegraph (Money) Bill.—As amended (by the Standing Committee), further considered.

Mr. Harold Cox (*Preston*) 1023

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 12, to leave out the words 'The telegraph Acts 1863 to 1903,' and insert the words 'developing the telephonic system aforesaid.'"—(*Mr. Harold Cox.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 1024
Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.) 1024

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

> "In page 1, line 13, after the word 'Treasury' to insert the words 'and after such Estimates have been laid upon the Table of the House for thirty days.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) 1025
The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) .. 1025
Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) 1026
Mr. Harold Cox 1028
Mr. Watt (Glasgow, College) 1028
Mr. Carlile (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) 1028

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 20 ; Noes, 107. (Division List No. 291).

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

> "In page 1, line 13, to leave out from the word 'Treasury,' to end of clause, and insert, 'The Treasury may, it they think fit, with a view to provide money for sums so authorised to be issued out of the Consolidated Fund, or for repaying to that Fund all or any part of the sums so issued, borrow by means of terminable annuities, for a term not exceeding twenty years, and all sums so borrowed shall be paid into the Exchequer. The said annuities shall be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament for the service of the Post Office, and, if those moneys are insufficient, shall be charged on and paid out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom or the growing produce thereof, at such times in each year as may be fixed by the Treasury.'" —(*Mr. Sydney Buxton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Harold Cox 1031
Sir F. Banbury 1031
Mr. Sydney Buxton 1031
Mr. Gretton (Rutland) 1032

Question put, and negatived.

Proposed words there inserted.

Bill to be read the third time on Monday next.

Post Office Sites Bill (RE-COMMITTED).

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

July 19.] *Page*

Clause 1 :—

Sir F. Banbury 1032

Amendment proposed—

" In page 2, line 11, to leave out from the word ' Act ' to the word ' shall ' in line 13."—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Sydney Buxton 1032
Mr. T. L. Corbett 1033
Sir F. Banbury 1033
Lord Balcarres 1034
The Attorney-General (*Sir J. Walton, Leeds, S.*) 1034

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 5 agreed to.

Clause 6 :—

Sir F. Banbury 1034

Amendment proposed—

" In page 4, line 30, to leave out Sub-section 1."—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, " That the words proposed to be left stand part of the clause."

Mr. Sydney Buxton 1035
Lord Balcarres 1036
Mr. Clavell Salter (*Hants, Basingstoke*) 1036
Mr. T. L. Corbett 1037
Mr. Sydney Buxton 1037
Mr. Fell (*Great Yarmouth*) 1038
Mr. Carlile 1038
Sir F. Banbury 1039

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 153 ; Noes, 26. (Division List No. 292.)

Mr. Gretton (*Rutland*) 1041

Amendment proposed—

" In page 4, line 34, to leave out Sub-section (2)."—(*Mr. Gretton.*)

Question proposed, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Sydney Buxton 1042
Mr. Forster (Kent, Sevenoaks) 1042
Mr. Clavell Salter 1043
Mr. Fell 1043
Mr. Sydney Buxton 1043

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 7 :—

Mr. Gretton 1044
Mr. Sydney Buxton 1045

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 8 and 9 agreed to.

Clause 10 :—

Sir F. Banbury 1045

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 10, to leave out Subsection (2)."—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Sydney Buxton 1046
Mr. Fell 1046

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 164; Noes, 25. (Division List No. 293.)

Clauses 10 and 11 agreed to.

On the Question that the Bill be reported without Amendment to the House.

Sir F. Banbury 1047

Bill reported without Amendment.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Sir F. Banbury 1049

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

July 19.] Page

Criminal Appeal Bill.—As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

Sir William Anson (*Oxford University*) 1051

New clause—

"On the hearing of any application for leave to appeal the Court of Criminal Appeal may, if they think fit, deal with the matter as though such application were an appeal under this Act.' "—(*Mr. Salter.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Sir John Walton 1052
Mr. Cave (*Surrey, Kingston*) 1053
Mr. Rees (*Montgomery Boroughs*) 1053
Viscount Turnour (*Sussex, Horsham*) 1054

Motion made, and Question put, "That the debate be now adjourned."

The House divided :—Ayes, 28 ; Noes, 173. (Division List No. 294.)

Original Question put, and negatived.

Mr. Cave 1057
Sir F. Banbury 1058

New clause—

"Notwithstanding anything herein contained this Act shall not take effect unless and until an Act shall have been passed authorising the appointment by His Majesty of not less than three additional Judges of the King's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice." —(*Mr. Cave.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Sir John Walton 1058
Mr. Carlile 1059
Mr. F. E. Smith (*Liverpool, Walton*) 1059

Question put, and negatived.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 7, to leave out the word 'seven' and insert the word 'eight.' "—(*Sir John Walton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'seven' stand part of the Bill.' "

Sir William Anson 1060
Mr. Clavell Salter 1060

Amendment agreed to.

Sir John Walton 1061

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 1, to leave out the word 'and,' and to insert the words '(5) Unless the Court direct to the contrary in cases where, in the opinion of the Court, the question is a question of law on which it would be convenient that separate judgments should be pronounced by the members of the Court.'"—(*Sir John Walton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'and' stand part of the Bill."

Sir William Anson 1062

Question put, and negatived.

Proposed words there inserted in the Bill.

Sir John Walton 1062

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 7, at the beginning, to insert the words, 'If in any case the prosecutor or defendant obtains the certificate of the Attorney-General that a decision of the Court of Criminal Appeal involves a point of law of exceptional public importance, he may appeal from that decision to the House of Lords, but subject thereto.'"—(*Sir John Walton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Atherley Jones (*Durham, N.W.*) 1063
Sir William Anson 1063
Mr. Cave 1063
Mr. Beale (*Ayrshire, S.*) 1064
Sir John Walton 1064

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. Boulton (*Huntingdonshire, Ramsey*) 1064

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 23, after the word 'registrar,' to insert the words 'and deputy registrar.'"—(*Mr. Boulton.*)

The Amendment was not seconded.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 26, to leave out the word 'Supreme,' and to insert the words 'King's Bench Division of the High.'"—(*Sir John Walton.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Sir William Anson 1065

July 22.] Page

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 33, to leave out the words 'on indictment,' and insert the words 'of an indictable offence other than an indictable offence triable by summary jurisdiction.'"—(*Sir William Anson*).

Question proposed, "That the words 'on indictment' stand part of the Bill."

Sir John Walton 1066

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 185; Noes, 37. (Division List No. 295.)

Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University) 1069
Mr. Cave 1073

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 1, to leave out paragraph (b) of Clause 3."—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'with the leave of the' stand part of the Bill."

Lord Balcarres 1076

Motion made, and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Lord Balcarres*)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C (added in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. Bennett; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. Hedges.

Report to lie upon the Table 1076

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to Standing Order No. 3.

Adjourned at one minute after Five o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 22ND JULY, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Richmond (Surrey) Electricity Supply Bill; North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments; and passed, and returned to the Commons 1077

Central London Railway Bill.—Read 3^{a}, and passed 1077

North Staffordshire Railway Bill.—The Order made on the 4th instant appointing certain Lords the Select Committee to consider the Bill, discharged 1077

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill (Dunstable Order).—Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the said Order, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read and ordered to lie on the Table: The Orders made on the 4th instant respecting the commitment of the Bill to a Select Committee in regard to the said Order, discharged 1077

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Killery's Divorce Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to 1077

Ashton-under-Lyne, Stalybridge, and Dukinfield (District) Waterworks Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 1077

Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments: The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 1077

Bude Gas Bill; King's Norton and Northfield Urban District Council Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 1077

Longton (Caroline Street Chapel) Charity Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1^{a}; to be printed; and to be read 2^{a} on Thursday next (The Lord Weardale). (No. 123) 1077

Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1^{a}; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland Act, 1899), deemed to have been read 2^{a} (The Lord Hamilton of Dalzell), and reported from the Committee; and Bill to be read 3^{a} on Wednesday the 31st instant. (No. 125) 1078

Aberdeen Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Read 2^{a} (according to Order), and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899) deemed to have been reported from the Committee; and Bill to be read 3^{a} To-morrow 1078

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.].—Read 3^{a} (according to Order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 1078

Board of Education Scheme (Hulme Trust Estates Educational) Confirmation Bill [SECOND READING].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord President of the Council (The Earl of Crewe) 1078

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

The Marquess of Salisbury 1080

On Question, Bill read 2^{a}, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

July 22.] *Page*

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS : ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3862. Denmark.
No. 3863. Japan (Tainan, South Formosa).
No. 3864. Persia (Resht and Astarabad).
No. 3865. Turkey (Basra).
No. 3866. France (Nice).
No. 3867. Turkey (Salonica). 1080

AGRICULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION (IRELAND).—Report on the trade in imports and exports at Irish ports during the year ended 31st December, 1905 1081

IRISH RAILWAYS.

1. First Report of the Viceregal Commission.
2. Appendix to same 1081

INDIA RAILWAYS.—Administration Report on the railways in India, for the calendar year 1906 1081

CONGESTION IN IRELAND (ROYAL COMMISSION).—Fifth Report of the Commissioners, with appendix (minutes of evidence taken in London, 12th to 28th March, 1907, and documents relating thereto) 1081

OSBORNE.—Report by the house governor and medical superintendent, for the year ended 31st March, 1907.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie upon the Table .. 1081

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.—Order in Council, dated 6th July, 1907, provided that Buckie shall be a place of registry for sea fishing boats .. 1081

GREENWICH HOSPITAL ACT, 1865.—Order in Council, dated 6th July, 1907, authorising a higher scale of salary for the Director of Greenwich Hospital 1081

WINTER ASSIZES ACTS, 1876 AND 1877.—Seven Orders in Council, dated 6th July, 1907, relating to the ensuing winter assizes 1081

EXTRADITION ACTS, 1870 TO 1906.—Orders in Council, dated 6th July, 1907—
For giving effect to a Supplementary Convention concluded between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and the Kingdom of Belgium for the mutual surrender of fugitive criminals.

For giving effect to an agreement concluded between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and the Kingdom of Norway for the mutual surrender of fugitive criminals.

Ordering that the operation of the Extradition Acts, 1870 to 1906, shall be suspended within the Dominion of Canada so long as Part I. of Chapter 155 of "The Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906," shall continue in force 1081

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.—Orders in Council, dated 6th July, 1907, Providing for the Government of Cyprus.

Entitled "The Ashanti Order in Council, 1907."

Entitled "The Northern Territories Order in Council, 1907."

Entitled "The Nyasaland Order in Council, 1907" 1082

BRITISH SETTLEMENTS ACT, 1887, AND FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.—Orders in Council, dated 6th July, 1907, entitled—The Pacific Order in Council, 1907;

The Pacific Islands Civil Marriages Order in Council, 1907 1082

NAVAL AND MARINE PAY AND PENSIONS ACT, 1865.—Orders in Council, dated 6th July, 1907, approving Memorials of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty praying sanction to—An Amendment of the regulations so as to provide that officers appointed to a surveying ship commissioned at home for service abroad shall draw surveying pay from the date of joining the ship;

The payment of certain allowances to naval and marine officers studying Chinese in China;

Certain modifications in the conditions of service of officers' servants;

A new scale of allowances to lamp trimmers on board His Majesty's ships 1082

SUPERANNUATION.—Treasury Minute, dated 15th July, 1907, granting a retired allowance to Mr. Harry Banks, officer of Beeston Station, 2nd Class Inland Revenue, under Section 2 of the Superannuation Act, 1887.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie upon the Table 1082

Post Office Sites Bill.—Brought from the Commons. Read 1ª; to be printed, and referred to the Examiners. (No. 124) 1083

ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSION—RETURN.

Earl Nelson 1083

Moved, "That there be laid before the House a Return showing (1) The present amount of the fund which devolved upon the Ecclesiastical Commissioners from the Church Building, Commissioners on the 1st January, 1857, under 19 and 20 Vict., c. 55, together with a Dr. and Cr. Account of the above fund since the 31st of October, 1876. (In continuation of Return No. 71A, ordered to be printed 22nd June, 1877); (2) The churches in aid of the erection of which grant or "nominal grants" have been made out of the above-named fund, with the amount of the grants in each case; the population of the district to be assigned to such churches at the time of making such grant, and the accommodation proposed to be afforded by the churches to which such grants have been made; also to specify whether the grant was

actually paid, or if paid, subsequently refunded. (In continuation of Return, No. 71, ordered to be printed 14th May, 1877); (3) The churches for which scales of pew rents have been fixed by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners under 19 and 20 Vict. c. 104, since the 3rd of February, 1876, specifying in each case the total number and position of the seats authorised to be let, the rents authorised to be taken, and the total number of sittings in each church; stating also, if any such scales have been rescinded since the original scale was fixed. (In continuation of Return No. 71, ordered to be printed 14th May, 1877); (4) The churches for which scales of pew rents have been fixed by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners under the Church Building Acts since the 9th of August, 1876, specifying in each case the total number and position of the seats authorised to be let, the rents authorised to be taken, and the total number of sittings in each church; stating also, if any such scales have been rescinded since the original scale was fixed. (In continuation of Return No. 71, ordered to be printed 14th May, 1877.)"
—(*The Earl Nelson.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

Qualification of Women (County and Town Councils) (Scotland) Bill [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to Order).

[The Earl of Onslow in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

The Earl of Camperdown 1085

Amendment moved:—

"In page 1, line 7, after the word 'not' to insert the words, '(*a*) be elected as convenor of a county council or provost of a burgh; or.'"
—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

Lord Hamilton of Dalzell 1086
Lord Balfour of Burleigh 1086
Lord Courtnay of Penwith 1087
The Marquess of Londonderry 1087
The Earl of Camperdown 1088
The Earl of Crewe 1088

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Camperdown 1089

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 11, to leave out from the word 'appeal' to the end of paragraph (*b*)."—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived; the Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow; and Bill to be printed as amended. [No. 126.]

THE AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS ACT, 1906.

The Earl of Camperdown .. 1089
Lord Lovat .. 1094
The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (*Earl Carrington*) 1095
Lord Balfour of Burleigh .. 1100
The First Lord of the Admiralty (*Lord Tweedmouth*) .. 1102
Earl Cawdor .. 1104
The Earl of Crewe .. 1105

IRISH POOR LAW REFORM.

Lord Monteagle of Brandon .. 1105

Moved to resolve, "That in the opinion of this House, the Irish Poor Law system demands the immediate attention of His Majesty's Government with a view to its reform."—(*Lord Monteagle of Brandon.*)

Lord Castletown .. 1111
The Earl of Mayo .. 1113
The Earl of Crewe .. 1116
The Earl of Meath .. 1120
Lord Ashbourne .. 1121
Lord Denman .. 1122

On Question, Motion, as amended, agreed to.

Injured Animals Act (1894) Amendment Bill.

House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª to-morrow .. 1123

Public Health (Scotland) Amendment Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to amend Sections 57, 58, and 59 of the Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1897, relating to the prevention of infectious diseases. Was presented by the Lord Hamilton of Dalzell; read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Wednesday, the 31st instant. (No. 127) .. 1123

Vaccination (Scotland) Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to amend the law with respect to vaccination in Scotland by authorising a statutory declaration of conscientious objection. Was presented by the Lord Hamilton of Dalzell; read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Thursday, the 1st of August next. (No. 128) .. 1123

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Eight o'clock, till to-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

July 22.] *Page*

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 22ND JULY, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table, Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]; Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow 1124

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz. :—Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow 1125

London and North Western Railway Bill; Penrith Urban District Council Bill; Worthing Gas Bill.—Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to 1125

Alton Military Hospital Bill [LORDS]; Electric Supply Corporation Bill [Lords].—Read, the third time, and passed, without Amendment .. 1125

Sheffield Corporation Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1125

Coventry Corporation Bill [LORDS]; Humber Conservancy Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 1125

Oxford and District Tramways Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 1125

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 1125

Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill (BY ORDER).—Read the third time and passed 1125

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP K.).—Ordered, That the said Arthur Caradoc Williams do attend the said Committee on Group K. of Private Bills To-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the Clock.. 1125

Merthyr Tydfil Stipendiary Justice Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1126

July 22.] *Page*

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to: Limited Partnerships Bill; British North America Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders, made by the Board of Trade under the General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Fleetwood, Portsmouth, and Sennen." [Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords] 1126

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 283] 1126

PETITIONS.

WEEKLY REST-DAY BILL.—Petitions in favour: From Clerkenwell and other places; and, Newcastle-on-Tyne and other places; to lie upon the Table .. 1126

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3862 to 3867 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1126

WINTER ASSIZES ACTS, 1876 AND 1877.—Copies presented, of Seven Orders in Council, dated 6th July, 1907, relating to the ensuing Winter Assizes [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1127

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.—Copies presented, of Order in Council, dated 6th July, 1907, providing that Buckie shall be a place of registry for Sea Fishing Boats [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1127

EXTRADITION ACTS, 1870 TO 1906.—Copies presented, of Orders in Council, dated 6th July, 1907, (1) for giving effect to a Supplementary Convention between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and the Kingdom of Belgium for the mutual surrender of fugitive criminals; (2) for giving effect to an Agreement concluded between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and the Kingdom of Norway for the mutual surrender of fugitive criminals; (3) ordering that the operation of the Extradition Acts, 1870 to 1906, shall be suspended within the Dominion of Canada, so long as Part I. of Chapter 155 of The Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, shall continue in force [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1127

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.—Copy presented, of Orders in Council, dated 6th July, 1907, (1) providing for the Government of Cyprus; (2) entitled The Ashanti Order in Council, 1907; (3) entitled The Northern Territories Order in Council, 1907; (4) entitled The Nyasaland Order in Council, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1127

BRITISH SETTLEMENTS ACT, 1887, AND FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.—Copies presented, of Orders in Council, dated 6th July, 1907, entitled: (1) The Pacific Order in Council, 1907; (2) The Pacific Islands Civil Marriages Order in Council, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1127

NAVAL AND MARINE PAY AND PENSIONS ACT, 1865.—Copies presented, of Orders in Council, dated 6th July, 1907, approving Memorials of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty praying sanction to: (1) An Amendment of

July 22.] Page

the Regulations so as to provide that officers appointed to a surveying ship commissioned at Home for service Abroad shall draw surveying pay from the date of joining the ship; (2) the payment of certain allowances to Naval and Marine officers studying Chinese in China; (3) certain modifications in the conditions of service of officers' servants; (4) a new scale of allowances to lamp-trimmers on board His Majesty's Ships [by Act]; to upon the Table 1127

GREENWICH HOSPITAL ACT, 1865.—Copy presented, of Order in Council dated 6th July, 1907, authorising a higher scale of salary for the Director of Greenwich Hospital [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1128

CONGESTION IN IRELAND (ROYAL COMMISSION).—Copy presented, of Fifth Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into and report upon the operation of the Acts dealing with Congestion in Ireland, with Appendix (Minutes of Evidence taken in London, 12th to 28th March, and Documents relating thereto) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1128

SUGAR.—Return ordered, "showing as far as possible, for each of the years 1887 to 1906, inclusive, the estimated production of cane and beet sugar, respectively, in the various producing countries of the world; the imports and exports of raw and refined sugar, distinguishing beet and other sorts, into and from the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Holland, the United States, Canada, and Australia, from and to the principal countries of origin and destination; the total consumption and consumption per head of the population on each of the above-named countries; and the exports of sugar of domestic production from each of the principal British Colonies and Possessions, together with the average declared import value of raw and refined sugar for the United Kingdom (in continuation of similar particulars contained in Parliamentary Paper, No. 353, of Session 1888.)" —(*Mr. Mitchell-Thomson*) 1128

IMPORT AND EXPORT TRADE (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Report on the Trade of Imports and Exports at Irish Ports during the year ended 31st December, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1129

IRISH RAILWAYS (VICEREGAL COMMISSION).—Copy presented, of First Report of the Commissioners, with Appendix [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1129

EAST INDIA (RAILWAYS).—Copy presented, of Administrative Report on the Railways in India for the year 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1129

OSBORNE.—Copy presented, of Report by the House Governor and Medical Superintendent at Osborne for the year ending 31st March, 1907, [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1129

CIVIL SERVICES (SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1907–8).—Estimate presented, of the Further Sums required to be voted for the Service of the year ending 31st March, 1908 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 263.] 1129

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

BASS ROCK VALUATION.—Question, Mr. J. D. White (Dumbartonshire); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1129

July 22.] Page

NAVAL MEDICAL INSPECTIONS.—Question, Mr. Alden (Middlesex, Tottenham); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1130

TRAINING COLLEGES.—Question, Viscount Castlereagh (Maidstone); Answer, Mr. McKenna 1130

IRISH ESTATE DUTY.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid); Answer, Mr. Asquith 1131

TEA DUTY IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Leverton Harris (Tower Hamlets, Stepney); Answer, Mr. Asquith 1131

CORN DUTY.—Question, Mr. Leverton Harris; Answer, Mr. Asquith 1132

INDIAN RUPEE COINAGE.—Question, Sir E. Sassoon (Hythe); Answer, Mr. Morley 1133

PLAGUE INOCULATION IN INDIA.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside); Answer, Mr. Morley 1133

IRISH SCHOOL BUILDING GRANTS.—Question, Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1134

KILMEEDY SCHOOL, LIMERICK.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1134

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1135

TOTTENHAM ESTATE EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. P. A. McHugh (Sligo, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1135

MULLAGHMORE FISH-CURING STATION.—Question, Mr. P. A. McHugh; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1136

SLIGO FISHING INDUSTRY.—Question, Mr. P. A. McHugh; Answer, Mr Birrell 1136

UNITED IRISH LEAGUE OFFICIALS AND EVICTED FARMS.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1137

REINFORCED CONCRETE AT WOOLWICH.—Question, Mr. Whitehead (Essex, S.E.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1137

YEOMANRY ARMS.—Question, Sir Samuel Scott (Marylebone, W.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1138

CIVIL SERVICE PENSIONS.—Question, Sir Samuel Scott; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1138

ST. HELENA POLICE.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1139

ST. HELENA FORTIFICATIONS.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1139

ST. HELENA FARMERS' TROUBLES.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1139

ST. HELENA MAGISTRATE'S SALARY.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1140

July 22.] *Page*

LEGAL APPEALS IN ST. HELENA.—Question, Mr. Sloan ; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1140

EMPLOYEE'S INSURANCE IN BRITISH CENTRAL AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs) ; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1141

ROSS-SHIRE SCHOOLS WATER SUPPLY.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty) ; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1141

PAUPER LUNACY IN THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.—Question, Mr. Weir ; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1142

ISLAND OF LEWIS WATER SUPPLY.—Question, Mr. Weir ; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1142

STORNOWAY MAILS.—Question, Mr. Weir ; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. 1143

BELLAGHY MAIL CAR SERVICE.—Question, Mr J. MacVeagh (Down, S.) ; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1143

SHANGHAI MAIL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox (Preston) ; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1144

POST OFFICE CONTRACTS AND THE WAGE CLAUSE.—Question, Mr. W. T. Wilson (Lancashire, Westhoughton) ; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1144

POST OFFICE TELEGRAPH MESSENGERS.—Question, Sir Samuel Scott ; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1145

TELEGRAM WORD COUNTING.—Question, Mr. W. T. Wilson ; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1145

GLYCERINATED CALF LYMPH.—Question, Mr. Weir ; Answer, Mr. John Burns 1146

COLWYN BAY WATER SUPPLY.—Question, Mr. Weir ; Answer, Mr. John Burns 1146

WORKHOUSE CHAPLAINS.—Question, Mr. Montgomery (Somersetshire, Bridgewater) ; Answer, Mr. John Burns 1147

ARDGLASS HARBOUR, COUNTY DOWN.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh ; Answer, Mr. T. W. Russell 1147

THE OFFICIAL DEBATES.—Question, Mr. Seaverns (Lambeth, Brixton) ; Answer, Mr. Runciman 1148

ORDNANCE SURVEY.—Question, Mr. Power (Waterford, E.) ; Answer, Sir E. Strachey 1148

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT ADMINISTRATION.—Question, Dr. Hazel (West Bromwich) ; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 1149

LIVERPOOL CUSTOMS WAREHOUSES.—Question, Mr. Cleland (Glasgow, Bridgeton) ; Answer, Mr. Asquith 1149

JOINT STOCK BANKS.—Question, Mr. Vincent-Kennedy (Cavan, W.) ; Answer, Mr. Asquith 1149

PROBATE FEES.—Question, Sir Edwin Cornwall (Bethnal Green, N.E.); Answer, Mr. Asquith 1150

LAND COMMISSION CLERKSHIPS.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1151

IRISH MINERAL RIGHTS.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1152

IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT CLERKS.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1153

LAND COMMISSION CLERICAL STAFF.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1153

IRISH SCHOOL BUILDINGS—TEACHERS' ROOMS.—Question, Mr. Barrie; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1154

POLLOCK ESTATE, COUNTY GALWAY.—Question, Mr. Hazleton (Galway, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1154

MALLARANNY RAILWAY.—Question, Dr. Ambrose (Mayo, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1154

SYNAN ESTATE, COUNTY LIMERICK.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1154

ALL-RED MAIL ROUTE.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1155

HIGHER DIVISION CLERKS.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 1155

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

H.M.S. "KING EDWARD VII."—THE DEFECTIVE RUDDER.—Question, Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.); Answer, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton) 1156

H.M.S. "BLAKE" AND H.M.S. "BLENHEIM."—Question, Captain Faber (Hampshire, Andover); Answer, Mr. Lambert 1156

DESTROYERS AT MALTA.—Questions, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth), Mr. Austen Chamberlain; Answers, Mr. Lambert.. 1157

THE HOME FLEET.—Questions, Mr. Fell; Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answers, Mr. Lambert 1157

SAFETY OF THE FLEET.—Question, Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford); Answer, Mr. Lambert 1158

NAVAL WHITE PAPER.—Question, Mr. Bellairs; Answer, Mr. Lambert .. 1158

WALES AND ARMY CONTRACTS.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane) 1159

IRVINE MOOR MANŒUVRES.—Question, Mr. Fell; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 1159

July 22.] *Page*

VOLUNTEERS AND THE TERRITORIAL ARMY.—Question, Mr. Arnold-Forster (Croydon); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1159

TERRITORIAL ARMY—STRENGTH FOR ACTIVE SERVICE.—Questions, Mr. Arnold-Forster; Answers, Mr. Haldane 1160

THE ARTILLERY.—Questions, Mr. Arnold-Forster, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Mr. Leverton Harris (Tower Hamlets, Stepney); Answers, Mr. Haldane 1161

THE PRIMROSE LEAGUE AND ARMY BANDS.—Question, Mr. Branch (Middlesex, Enfield); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1163

RABIES IN RHODESIA.—Question, Mr. Ridsdale (Brighton); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 1164

CAPE COLONY AND TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER SELF-GOVERNMENT.—Question, Mr. Mackarness (Berkshire, Newbury); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1164

UNREST IN EAST AFRICA.—Questions, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland), Mr. Ashley, Mr. Arnold-Forster; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1165

MR. CHURCHILL TO VISIT EAST AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1166

RAND STRIKE.—Questions, Mr. Mackarness, Mr. Harold Cox (Preston); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1166

ZOMBA GARRISON.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1167

ST. HELENA NATIVES AND THE TRANSVAAL MINES.—Question, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1168

BRITISH INTERESTS IN ASIA MINOR.—Question, Sir E. Sassoon (Hythe); Answer, Mr. J. A. Pease (Essex, Saffron Walden), for Sir E. Grey 1168

KAID SIR HARRY MACLEAN.—Question, Mr. Maclean (Bath); Answer, Mr. J. A. Pease 1168

KHEDIVIAL LAW SCHOOL—CASE OF M. LAMBERT.—Question, Dr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford); Answer, Mr. J. A. Pease 1169

HORSE-TAXIMETER CABS.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) .. 1169

LONDON POLICE AND THE YIDDISH LANGUAGE.—Question, Mr. Starkey (Nottinghamshire, Newark); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1169

CONVICT RICHARD COLES.—Question, Mr. Ashley; Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. 1170

WEAK-MINDED PRISONERS.—Question, Mr. Alden (Middlesex, Tottenham); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1170

BRITISH COLONIAL CONSULS.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox; Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 1170

July 22.]

Page

LIFE INSURANCE.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 1172

SCOTTISH EMIGRATION.—Question, Mr. J. D. White (Dumbartonshire); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 1172

NETHERFIELD RAILWAY CROSSING FATALITY.—Question, Mr. Thorne (West Ham, S.); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 1173

ALL-BRITISH MAIL ROUTE TO AUSTRALIA.—Questions, Mr. Fell, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 1173

GAS LIGHT AND COKE COMPANY.—Question, Mr. Thorne; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 1174

ROYAL COMMISSION ON SEWAGE DISPOSAL.—Questions, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 1175

THE POST OFFICE AND THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Captain Norton (Newington, W.), for Mr. Sydney Buxton 1175

P. & O. MAIL CONTRACT.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox, Mr. Smeaton (Stirlingshire); Answer, Captain Norton, for Mr. Sydney Buxton 1175

WESTMORELAND TELEPHONES.—Question, Mr. Stewart Smith (Westmoreland, Kendal); Answer, Captain Norton, for Mr. Sydney Buxton 1175

LOW VALLEY SCHOOL.—Questions, Mr. Lane-Fox (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash), Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answers, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) 1176

THE EDUCATION REGULATIONS.—Questions, Mr. Carlile (Hertfordshire, St. Albans); Answers, Mr. McKenna 1178

SECONDARY SCHOOL CODE FOR WALES.—Question, Sir Henry Craik (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities); Answer, Mr. McKenna 1179

EDUCATION GRANT.—Questions, Mr. Samuel Roberts(Sheffield, Ecclesall), Mr. Alden; Answers, Mr. McKenna 1179

WELSH CODE.—Question, Mr. Samuel Roberts; Answer, Mr. McKenna .. 1180

THE MALL.—Question, Mr. Starkey; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Harcourt, Lancashire, N.E., Rossendale) 1180

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE'S REPORTS.—Question, Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish (Derbyshire, W.) 1181

FISHERY PROTECTION.—Questions, Mr. Cathcart-Wason, Mr. Power (Waterford, E.); Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; Answers, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 1181

SITE FOR DALMUIR SCHOOL. — Question, Mr. J. D. White; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1182

HOUSE LETTING IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. Cleland (Glasgow, Bridgeton); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1183

IRISH DAIRY INDUSTRY.—Question, Mr. Halpin (Clare, W.); Answer, The Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland (Mr. T. W. Russell, Tyrone, S.) 1183

ILLEGAL TRAWLING IN LOUGH FOYLE.—Question, Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.); Answer, Mr. T. W. Russell 1183

DONEGAL AND KERRY FISHERY HARBOURS.—Question, Mr. P. A. McHugh (Sligo, N.); Answer, Mr. T. W. Russell 1184

BANBRIDGE PETTY SESSIONS.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh; Answer, The Solicitor-General for Ireland (Mr. Redmond Barry, Tyrone, N.) 1184

CANADA AND IRISH EXPORTS.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1185

BALLINSKELLIGS POSTMASTERSHIP.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Captain Norton (for Mr. Sydney Buxton) 1185

ROSSLARE AND FISHGUARD MAIL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. William Abraham (Cork County, N.E.); Answer, Captain Norton 1186

EMOLUMENTS OF BRITISH LAW OFFICERS.—Question, Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 1187

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Question, Mr. R. Duncan (Lanarkshire, Govan); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1187

PACIFIC ISLANDERS' PROTECTION ACT.—Question, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1188

CHURCH OF ENGLAND WORSHIP.—Question, Mr. Austin Taylor (Liverpool, East Toxteth); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1188

THE OFFICIAL DEBATES.—Question, Mr. Byles; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1188

HOME OFFICE VOTE.—Questions, Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield), Mr. Rees; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1188

ISLANDS OF ST. THOME AND PRINCIPE.—Questions, Mr. Cathcart Wason, Mr. Byles, Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1189

Kyd. 18—E. Gyngell.—Sat.—Aug. 10.

THE GOVERNMENT AND ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 1190
Mr. Speaker 1191

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill (ALLOCATION OF TIME).

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 1192

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Committee stage and Report stage of the Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, including the Financial Resolution relating thereto, shall be proceeded with in the following manner :—(*a*) That Clauses 1 and 2 and the Committee stage of the Financial Resolution, if and so far as not previously disposed of, be proceeded with and proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the first allotted day ; (*b*) that the Report stage of the Financial Resolution and the remaining clauses of the Bill, and any new Government clauses and any new Government schedules, and any other matter necessary to bring the Committee stage to a conclusion (if and so far as not previously disposed of), be proceeded with and brought to a conclusion on the second allotted day, and that the Chairman report the Bill to the House without Question put ; (*c*) that one allotted day be given to the Report stage of the Bill, and that all matters necessary to bring the Report stage to a conclusion be proceeded with, and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on that day. After this order comes into operation, any day (other than Friday) shall be considered an allotted day for the purposes of this order on which the Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill is put down as the first Order of the Day, or on which any stage of the Financial Resolution relating thereto is put down as the first Order of the Day, followed by the Bill. At 10.30 p.m. on any allotted day on which proceedings on any business allotted to that day are brought to a conclusion, the Chairman or Speaker shall, if those proceedings have not already been brought to a conclusion, put forthwith the Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given, but no other Amendments, and on any Question necessary to dispose of the business to be concluded, and in the case of Government Amendments or of Government new clauses or schedules, he shall put only the Question that the Amendment be made, or that the clause or schedule be added to the Bill, as the case may be. Any Private Business which is set down for consideration at 8.15 p.m. on any allotted day shall, instead of being taken on that day as provided by the Standing Order "Time for taking Private Business," be taken after the conclusion of the proceedings on the Bill for that day, and any Private Business so taken may be proceeded with, though opposed, notwithstanding the Standing Order "Sittings of the House." At 11 p.m. on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order of the Day, or if that day is a Friday at 5 p.m., the Speaker shall put forthwith any Question necessary to complete the proceedings on that stage of the Bill. Proceedings to which this order relates shall not, on any day on which any proceedings or business are to be brought to a conclusion under this order, be interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to the Sittings of the House. After the passing of this order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill (including the Financial Resolution relating thereto), stand as first Order of the Day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor Motion for adjournment under Standing Order 10, nor Motion to postpone a clause, shall be received unless moved by a Minister of the Crown, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith without debate."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Mr. A. J. Balfour (*City of London*) 1195
Mr. John Redmond (*Waterford*) 1198

July 22.]

Page

Mr. Laurence Hardy (Kent, Ashford) 1202
Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.) 1203
The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 1207
Mr. Walter Long (Dublin, S.) 1208
Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool) 1211
Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 1212
Colonel Lockwood (Essex, Epping) 1215
Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.) 1215
Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, E.) 1217
Mr. James Campbell (Dublin University) 1217

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 293 ; Noes, 85. (Division List No. 296.)

Telegraph (Money) Bill.—Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Bill be now read the third time."

Mr. Harold Cox (Preston) 1225
Mr. Watt (Glasgow, College) 1228

Amendment proposed—

" To leave out the word ' now ' and at the end of the Question to add the words ' upon this day three months.' "—(*Mr. Harold Cox.*)

Question proposed, " That the word ' now ' stand part of the Question."

Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 1228

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the debate be now adjourned." —(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) 1229

Question put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 3 :—

Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 1230

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 1, line 7, after the word 'purposes,' to insert the words 'if, after having offered to the owner of such lands the fair market value thereof, he has refused to sell to the Commissioners and the Commissioners shall use such lands.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The Chief Secretary for Ireland (*Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.*) 1230
Mr. Chas. Craig (*Antrim, S.*) 1232

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—
Mr. Charles Craig 232

> "In page 1, line 8, to leave out the word 'may' and insert the word 'shall.'"—(*Mr. James Campbell.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Charles Craig 1232

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 1, line 9, after the word 'estate,' to insert the words, 'Provided always that the total amount of land to be acquired under this Act shall not exceed 80,000 acres, and a separate record of all land so acquired shall be kept by the Commissioners and shall be available for inspection by any person or persons claiming to be aggrieved.'"—(*Mr. Charles Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Birrell 1234
Mr. Walter Long 1234
Viscount Castlereagh (*Maidstone*) 1235
Mr. Barrie (*Londonderry, N.*) 1236
Mr. A. J. Balfour (*City of London*) 1237
Sir E. Carson (*Dublin University*) 1237
The Attorney-General for Ireland (*Mr. Cherry, Liverpool, Exchange*) .. 1239
Mr. Wyndham (*Dover*) 1240
Mr. Ashley (*Lancashire, Blackpool*) 1241
Mr. James Campbell 1242

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 65 ; Noes, 265. (Division List No. 297.)

Mr. Charles Craig 1247

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 1, line 9, at end to insert the words, 'The Estates Commissioners shall not be at liberty to refuse to declare tenanted

July 22.] *Page*

lands an estate by reason of the fact that the owner has not agreed to sell an untenanted portion of his lands to the Commissioners.' "—(*Mr. Charles Craig.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Ashley 1248
Mr. Cherry 1249
Mr. Charles Craig 1249
Mr. J. F. Mason (*Windsor*) 1250

Amendment proposed—

" In page 1, line 9, at the end, to insert the words ' Provided that, where part of an estate is to be acquired compulsorily, it shall be lawful for the owner to require that the whole estate shall be so taken.' "—(*Mr. James Mason.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Charles Craig 1251
Mr. Cherry 1252
Mr. Walter Long 1252
Mr. Clancy 1253
Mr. Cherry 1254
Mr. James Campbell 1255
Mr. Flynn (*Cork, N.*) 1257
Mr. Barrie 1258
Sir E. Carson 1259
Mr. Birrell 1259
Mr. J. F. Mason 1260
Mr. T. L. Corbett 1260
Sir F. Banbury 1260
The Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland (*Mr. T. W. Russell, Tyrone, S.*) 1262
Mr. Charles Craig 1263
Colonel Kenyon-Slaney (*Shropshire, Newport*) 1264

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 76 ; Noes, 284. (Division List No. 298.)

Mr. Clancy 1269

Amendment proposed—

" In page 1, line 14, to leave out from ' 1903 ' to the word ' who ' in line 16."—(*Mr. Clancy.*)

Question proposed, " That the words proposed to be left out down to the word ' before ' in line 16, stand part of the clause."

Page
Mr. Birrell 1270
Mr. John Redmond 1271
Mr. Walter Long 1271
Mr. Charles Craig 1272
Mr. O'Shee (Waterford, W.) 1274
Mr. James Campbell 1275

Question put, and negatived.

Mr. Condon (Tipperary, E.) 1278

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 18, to leave out the words 'May, nineteen hundred and seven,' and to insert the words 'January, nineteen hundred and eight.'"—(*Mr. Condon.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Birrell 1279
Mr. Walter Long 1279
Mr. O'Shee 1279

Amendment negatived.

And, it being Eleven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Bill.—Read a second time, and committed to a Standing Committee 1280

ADJOURNMENT.

On the Question that the House be now adjourned.

Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) 1280

Adjourned at Thirteen minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 23RD JULY, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.—Report from, that the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the London County Council (General Powers) Bill ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed, subject to the restoration of the definition of a "Tenement House" to the form in which it was inserted in the Bill as introduced into Parliament. Read, and agreed to 1281

July 23.] Page

Local Government Board (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill—Reported, without Amendment, and recommitted to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow 1281

Ashton-under-Lyne, Stalybridge, and Dukinfield (District) Waterworks Bill [H.L.].—Commons' Amendments considered and agreed to .. 1281

Sunderland Corporation Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments; and passed, and returned to the Commons 1281

Alton Military Hospital Bill [H.L.]; Electric Supply Corporation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to 1281

Sheffield Corporation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 1281

London and North-Western Railway Bill; Penrith Urban District Council Bill; Worthing Gas Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 1281

Aberdeen Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 1281

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill.—Committed: The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection in regard to the Chelmsford Order.. 1281

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill.—Committed: The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection in regard to the Norwich Order 1281

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill.—Brought from the Commons, and read 1ª; to be printed, and referred to the Examiners. (No. 133 1282

Local Government Provisional Orders Bill (No. 7) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 15) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill 1282

Moved, That the order made on the 20th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 18th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2ª.—(*Lord Allendale.*)

The Chairman of Committees (*The Earl of Onslow*) 1282
Lord Avebury 1282

On Question, Motion agreed to, and Bills read 2ª accordingly.

PETITION.

ADVERTISEMENTS REGULATION BILL.—Petition for Amendment of; of Fulham Borough Council; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 1282

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TREATY SERIES, No. 21 (1907).— Accession of the Commonwealth of Australia to the Industrial Property Convention of 1883, as modified by the Additional Act of 1900, 5th August, 1907 1283

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Regulations applicable to schools for blind, defective, and epileptic children.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1283

Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Select Committee (with the Proceedings of the Committee) made, and to be printed. (No. 130.): Bill reported with Amendments and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next; and to be printed as amended. (No. 131.): Minutes of Evidence laid upon the Table, and to be delivered out. 1283

Municipal Representation Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Select Committee (with the Proceedings of the Committee) made, and to be printed. (No. 132.): Bill reported without Amendment, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House. Minutes of Evidence, with an Appendix, laid upon the Table, and to be delivered out 1283

STANDING COMMITTEE.—Report from the Committee of Selection for the Standing Committee that they have added the Lord Granard (E. Granard) to the Standing Committee. Read, and ordered to lie on the Table .. 1283

Imported Watch-Cases Bill.—Reported from the Standing Committee without Amendment, and to be read 3ª on Thursday next 1283

Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to Order) and passed, and sent to the Commons .. 1283

Companies (Consolidation) Bill [H.L.] [SECOND READING].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of Granard 1284

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

Advertisements Regulation Bill.—Bill read 3ª (according to Order).

Lord Killanin 1284

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 7, to insert the following new clause: 'It shall be the duty of every metropolitan borough council to enforce within its own area any by-laws made by the London County Council under Paragraph (1) of Section 2 of this Act, and any expenses incurred by a metropolitan borough council in the execution of this provision shall be defrayed as part of the expenses of that council.'"—(*Lord Killanin.*)

July 23.

Page
Lord Balfour of Burleigh 1285

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*The Earl of Portsmouth.*)

The Earl of Wemyss 1285
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1287
Lord Haversham 1290
The Earl of Mount Edgcumbe 1292
The Earl of Donoughmore 1295
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (The Earl of Elgin) 1297

On Question, Motion agreed to; Bill read 3ª accordingly, with the Amendments.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 19, after the word 'for' to insert the words 'the appointment by the Army Council during the first three years after the passing of this Act, and subsequently for.'"—(*The Earl of Erroll.*)

The Under-Secretary of State for War (The Earl of Portsmouth) .. 1300
The Earl of Donoughmore 1301
The Earl of Crewe 1302
Lord Newton 1302

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Lovat 1302

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 25, after the word 'regulations' to insert the words 'which shall be issued to County Associations not later than the first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and nine.'"—(*Lord Lovat.*)

The Earl of Portsmouth 1302
Viscount Midleton 1303

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 25, after the word 'regulations' to insert the words 'which shall be issued t oCounty Associations from time to time, and on the first occasion not later than the first day of January, 1909.'"—(*Viscount Midleton.*)

On Question, "That these words be here inserted," their Lordships divided:—Contents, 62; Not-Contents, 32.

The Earl of Mount-Edgcumbe *1305*

Amendment moved—

"To leave out Clause 8."—(*The Earl of Mount-Edgcumbe.*)

The Earl of Portsmouth 1305
The Earl of Mount-Edgcumbe 1306
The Marquess of Salisbury 1306
The Earl of Elgin 1307

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The Earl of Mount-Edgcumbe 1307

Amnedment moved—

"In page 9, line 15, to leave out 'a' and to insert the word 'such,' and in lines 15 and 16 to leave out the words 'for which an association has been established under this Act' and to insert the words 'as he may select.'"—(*The Earl of Mount-Edgcumbe.*)

The Earl of Portsmouth 1307

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The Marquess of Salisbury 1308

Amendment moved—

"In page 21, line 29, after the word 'final,' to insert the words 'The corresponding unit of the Territorial Force shall, in the event of any such transfer, become entitled, notwithstanding the terms of any trust, limitation, or condition affecting the property so transferred to the estate or interest in such propery of the unit to the property of which the order relates; but, subject to this provision, the interest of any beneficiary other than such unit shall not, without the consent of such beneficiary, be effected. The order may, if it be deemed proper, having regard to the special circumstances of any case, provide for the appointment of special trustees to act together with or to the exclusion of the association in regard to any such property and such special trustees may be the existing trustees of such property.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

The Earl of Portsmouth 1308

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill passed, and returned to the Commons; and to be printed as amended. (No. 129.)

Qualification of Women (County and Town Councils) (Scotland) Bill [H.L.].—Amendments reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next 1309

Injured Animals Act (1894) Amendment Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed 1309

House adjourned at half-past Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 23RD JULY, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill [LORDS]; Tynemouth Corporation (Water) Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1309

Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill [LORDS.]—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 1309

Pasley Children Legitimisation Bill [LORDS.]—As amended, considered; to be read the third time. 1310

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [LORDS]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [Lords]; Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords.]—Read a second time, and committed 1310

Colne Valley Water Bill [LORDS.]—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1310

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to: Central London Railway Bill, without Amendment; RICHMOND (SURREY) ELECTRICITY SUPPLY BILL and North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill, with Amendments; Amendments to—Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [Lords]; without Amendment 1310

PETITIONS.

CONGO FREE STATE.—Petition from Birkenhead, for protection of the Native Races; to lie upon the Table 1310

LAND VALUES (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Greenock, against; to lie upon the Table 1310

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.—Petition from Horncastle, against; to lie upon the Table 1310

SMALL LANDOWNERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Bathgate, against; to lie upon the Table 1310

SUNDAY TRADING.—Petition from Rowley Regis, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 1311

WEEKLY REST-DAY BILL.—Petition from Tufnell Park and other places, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1311

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Copy presented, of Regulations applicable to Schools for Blind, Deaf, Defective, and Epileptic Children [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1311

Page

Treaty Series (No. 21, 1907).—Copy presented, of Accession of the Commonwealth of Australia to the Industrial Property Convention of 1883, as modified by the additional Act of 1900, 5th August, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1311

University Colleges (Great Britain) (Grant in Aid).—Copies ordered, "of (1) Treasury Minute, dated the 31st day of January, 1906, appointing the Advisory Committee; (2) Treasury Minute, dated the 4th day of March, 1907, adding Mr. F. G. Ogilvie, C.B., to the Committee; (3) Report of Advisory Committee, dated the 6th day of June, 1907, with Appendix containing the Reports of the Inspectors; and (4) Treasury Minute on the Committee's Report, dated the 9th day of July, 1907."—*Mr. Runciman* .. 1311

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Emigrants from Scotland.—Question, Mr. J. D. White (Dumbartonshire); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 1312

Allowances to Staffs of Royal Ordnance Factory and Army Accounts Department.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1313

Police Protection in Ireland.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1314

Grants to Training Colleges.—Question, Viscount Castlereagh (Maidstone); Answer, Mr. McKenna 1319

Army Clothing Contracts with Irish Firms.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1322

Religious Instruction in Secondary Schools.—Question, Viscount Castlereagh; Answer, Mr. McKenna 1323

Rupees Imported to Mombasa by the National Bank of India.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Morley 1324

Profit on Rupee Coinage.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay; Answer, Mr. Morley 1324

Cost of Repatriation of Chinese Coolies.—Question, Captain Faber (Hampshire, Andover); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1325

Crown Colonies and Self-Governing Dependencies.—Question, Mr. H. J. Tennant (Berwickshire); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1325

Salvage Claim on Nets of Alexander Smith of Cellardyke.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray (St. Andrews Burghs); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 1326

Public Elementary Schools Transferred from Non-provided to Provided Class.—Question, Mr. Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe); Answer, Mr. McKenna 1327

Exclusion from School on Account of Ringworm.—Question, Dr. Cooper (Southwark, Bermondsey); Answer, Mr. McKenna 1327

Collection of Rates—Cost of Legal Proceedings.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1328

July 23.] *Page*

MOTOR CAR ACCIDENTS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. 1329

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD REPORT—DELAY IN PUBLICATION.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. John Burns 1330

SANITARY CONDITION OF ST. ASAPH RURAL DISTRICT.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. John Burns 1331

DISTRICT COUNCILS AND THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT, 1875.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. John Burns 1331

SHAREHOLDERS OF TRAWLING COMPANIES MEMBERSHIP OF THE SCOTTISH FISHERY BOARD.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1331

HOLDING NOT LIABLE TO SUB-DIVISION UNDER THE SMALL LANDOWNERS BILL.—Question, Mr. Munro Ferguson (Leith Burghs); Answer, Mr. Sinclair .. 1332

PENSION FOR LATE SUB-POSTMISTRESS OF GORTON.—Question, Mr. Hodge (Lancashire, Gorton); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1332

IMPROVEMENT OF SANITARY CONDITIONS OF THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1333

EVICTED TENANT—APPLICATION OF MATHIAS BRADY.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1333

DUBLIN POLICE AND INTOXICATED PERSONS ENTERING LICENSED PREMISES.—Question, Mr. J. P. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1333

ANTI-TYPHOID INOCULATION OF BRITISH TROOPS.—Question, Sir W. J. Collins (St. Pancras, W.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1334

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

DESTROYERS ON THE CHINA STATION.—Questions, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answers, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Lambert, Devonshire, South Molton) 1335

DESTROYERS IN THE MEDITERRANEAN.—Questions, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Bellairs, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, E.), Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool), Mr. Austen Chamberlain (Worcestershire, E.); Answers, Mr. Lambert .. 1335

THE COASTGUARD.—Questions, Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye); Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.); Answers, Mr. Lambert 1336

H.M.S. "EDWARD VII." RUDDER.—Questions, Mr. Courthope, Mr. Arthur Henderson (Durham Barnard Castle); Answers, Mr. Lambert .. 1337

WARSHIPS IN WEST INDIAN WATERS.—Questions, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend), Mr. Harold Cox (Preston); Answers Mr. Lambert. 1337

LIFE OF A DESTROYER.—Question, Mr. Bellairs; Answer, Mr. Lambert. .. 1337

NUMBER OF DESTROYERS.—Question, Mr. Bellairs; Answer, Mr. Lambert .. 1338

H.M.S. "RENOWN."—Question, Mr. Gretton (Rutland); Answer, Mr. Lambert 1339

July 23.]

Page

DEFENCE OF HOME WATERS.—Questions, Mr. Gretton, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Mr. Lambert 1339

FLEET CRUISERS.—Question, Mr. C. E. Price (Edinburgh Central); Answer, Mr. Lambert 1340

NAVAL STATISTICS, SHIPS IN FULL COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. Hunt; Answer, Mr. Lambert 1340

THE SHOOTING TEAM FOR THE COLONIES.—Questions, Mr. Courthope, Mr. R. Duncan (Lanarkshire, Govan); Answers, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. Buchanan, Perthshire, E.), The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) 1340

QUEEN'S BARRACKS PERTH.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Buchanan 1340

DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE AND OLD SOLDIERS.—Questions, Mr. O'Shee (Waterford, W.), Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.), Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answers, Mr. Buchanan 1342

ARMY PENSIONS.—Questions, Mr. Clynes (Manchester, N.E.), Mr. Crooks (Woolwich); Answers, Mr. Buchanan 1343

RANGE MARKERS AND THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT.—Question, Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire Oswestry); Answer, Mr. Buchanan 1344

VICTORIA BARRACKS WINDSOR.—Question, J. F. Mason (Windsor); Answer, Mr. Buchanan 1344

PLAGUE IN INDIA.—Question, Mr. O'Grady (Leeds, E.); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) 1344

ALARMIST TELEGRAMS FROM INDIA.—Question, Mr. O'Grady; Answer, Mr. Morley 1345

COCONADA DISTURBANCES.—Questions, Mr. O'Grady, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answers, Mr. Morley 1346

CASE OF HABIL SIRCAR.—Question, Mr. O'Grady; Answer, Mr. Morley .. 1346

SOMALILAND GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS ALLOWANCES.—Question, Captain Faber (Hampshire, Andover); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 1347

TRANSVAAL LOAN BILL.—Questions, Captain Faber, Sir Gilbert Parker, Mr. Pike Pease; Answers, Mr. Churchill 1347

NEW HEBRIDES.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, Mr. Churchill .. 1348

ST. HELENA.—Question, Sir Gilbers Parker; Answer, Mr. Churchill .. 1349

ORANGE RIVER COLONY FARM VALUATIONS.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1350

BRITISH CIVIL SERVANTS IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1350

Isthmian Canal Labour.—Questions, Mr. Starkey (Nottinghamshire, Newark), An Hon. Member, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answers, Mr. Churchill 1351

East African Railway and Rupee Currency.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1352

Chinese Labour—Payment in Rupees.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay; Answer, Mr. Churchill 352

Johannesburg Mines Supply of Labour.—Question, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1353

Turkish Customs Duties.—Question, Mr. Lynch (Yorks, W.R., Ripon); Answer, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir E. Grey, Northumberland Berwick) 1354

Congo Free State Imports.—Question, Mr. Alden (Middlesex, Tottenham); Answer, Sir E. Grey 1354

Nile Bridge at Khartoum.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Sir E. Grey 1356

Egyptian State Railways and Telegraphs.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Sir E. Grey 1356

Egyptian Government Officials Salaries.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Sir E. Grey 1355

Baghdad Railway.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, Sir E. Grey 1356

Egyptian Postal Rates.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside), Mr. Harold Cox; Answer, Sir E. Grey 1356

Turkish Troops at Bemba.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson; Answer, Sir E. Grey 1357

Boutros Chali Pasta.—Questions, Mr. J. M. Robertson, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Sir E. Grey, Mr. Speaker 1357

Khedivial Law School—Case of Mr. Lambert.—Question, M. J. M. Robertson; Answer, Sir E. Grey 1358

The Hague Conference.—Question, Mr. Samuel Roberts (Sheffield, Ecclesall); Answer, Sir E. Grey 1358

Kaid Maclean.—Question, Mr. Fell; Answer, Sir E. Grey 1359

Guaranteed Colonial Loans.—Question, Mr. Fell; Answer, Mr. Asquith .. 1359

Income-Tax on Irish Land Purchase.—Question, Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.); Answer, Mr. Asquith 1359

Flogging in Prisons.—Question, Mr. Luttrell (Devonshire, Tavistock); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 1360

BROOKLANDS MOTOR RACES.—Questions, Mr. Marnham (Surrey, Chertsey), Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 1360

POOR LAW CHILDREN.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease; Answer, Mr. John Burns .. 1361

COST OF BOARDING-OUT PAUPER CHILDREN.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease; Answer, Mr; John Burns 1361

EMIGRATION STATISTICS.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Mr. Kearley, Devonport) 1362

COAL—SHORT WEIGHT.—Question, Mr. Clough (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton); Answer, Mr. Kearley 1362

LIGHT RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS.—Question, Mr. Clough; Answer, Mr. Kearley 1362

KIRK SMEATON BRIDGE.—Questions, Mr. Clough; Answers, Mr. Kearley .. 1363

TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE ACCOUNTS.—Question, Mr. J. T. Mason; Answer, Captain Norton (Newington, W.), for Mr. Sydney Buxton 1363

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) 1364

GIGGLESWICK AND RATHMELL CHARITIES.—Question, Mr. Clough; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) 1364

SMALL HOLDINGS IN SCOTLAND.—Questions, Sir J. Jardine (Roxburghshire), Mr. Laidlaw (Renfrewshire, E.); Answers, The Treasurer of the Household (Sir E. Strachey, Somersetshire) 1364

THE SUPERIOR OF KELSO.—Question, Sir J. Jardine; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 1366

BIRTH STATISTICS.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 1366

LUNACY IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 1366

MENTALLY WEAK AND DEAF AND DUMB.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1367

SWANLINBAR LICENSING PROSECUTION.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1367

IRISH TEACHERS' SALARIES.—Question, Mr. Mooney (Newry); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1368

IRISH EVICTED HOLDINGS.—Questions, Viscount Castlereagh (Maidstone); Answers, Mr. Birrell 1369

LORDS AND COMMONS.—Question, Captain Faber; Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 1369

July 23.] *Page*

INFANTILE MORTALITY.—Question, Mr. Courthope; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1370

PARLIAMENT AND INDIA.—Questions, Sir J. Jardine, Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1370

THE "VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS."—Questions, Mr. Mooney (Newry), Mr. John Redmond (Waterford), Mr. Clancy (Dublin County, N.); Answers, Mr. Speaker 1371

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London), Mr. John Redmond, Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.), Mr. Crooks (Woolwich), Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim S.), Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1372

PROCEDURE (ANTICIPATORY MOTIONS).—Report from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence and an Appendix, brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 264.] .. 1375

NEW MEMBER SWORN.—Albert Victor Grayson, esquire, for the Southern Part of the West Riding of the County of York (Colne Valley Division) .. 1375

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.—Third Report brought up, and read, with Minutes of Evidence.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 265.] .. 1375

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C (added in respect of the Small Holding and Allotments Bill): Mr. Nicholls; and had appionted in substitution (in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. George Hardy.

Report to lie upon the Table 1375

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Cause 1:—

Mr. Staveley-Hill (Staffordshire, Kingswinford) 1375

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 19, after the word 'holdings,' to insert the words 'and who, at the time of application were domiciled in Ireland.'"—(*Mr. Staveley-Hill.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Page
The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 1376
Mr. Moore (Armagh, N.) 1377
Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.) 1378
Mr. James Campbell (Dublin University) 1379
Mr. O'Shee (Waterford, W.) 1380
Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.) 1381
Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.) 1382
Mr. James Campbell 1382
The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 1383
Mr. Meysey-Thompson (Staffordshire, Handsworth) 1385
Mr. Moore 1385
Viscount Castlereagh (Maidstone) 1388

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 75 ; Noes, 303. (Division List No. 299.)

Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 1391

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 19, after the word 'Commissioners' to insert the words 'after a public hearing of all parties interested.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Cherry 1394
Mr. Meysey-Thompson 1395
Mr. Clancy 1395
Mr. Charles Craig 1396
Viscount Castlereagh 1397
Mr. Moore 1397
Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) 1398
Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.) 1399
Mr. Walter Long (Dublin, S.) 1400
Mr. Birrell 1402
Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.) 1403
Mr. Charles Craig 1404

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 88 ; Noes, 321. (Division List No. 300.)

Mr. James Campbell 1409

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 20, to leave out the word 'consider,' and insert the words 'have, prior to the date of the passing of this Act, determined.'"—(*Mr. James Campbell.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'consider' stand part of the clause."

Mr. Birrell 1410
Mr. Moore 1411
Mr. Meysey-Thompson 1412
Mr. Ashley 1412

July 23.] Page

Sir F. Banbury **1412**
Mr. Walter Long **1413**
Mr. Birrell **1414**
Mr. Butcher (Cambridge University) **1414**

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 314 ; Noes, 92. (Division List No. 301.)

Mr. Moore 1419

Amendment proposed—

"At the end of the clause to add the words 'Provided that such persons have been evicted for non-payment of rent or under judgment or decree for rent.' "—(*Mr. Moore.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool, Exchange) .. 1420
Mr. T. M. Healy 1422
Mr. Walter Long 1423
Mr. Birrell 1424
Mr. Herbert (Buckingshamshire, Wycombe) 1424

Question put, and negatived.

Viscount Castlereagh 1425

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 22, to leave out Sub-section (*b*)."—(*Viscount Castlereagh.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'new tenants' stand part of the clause."

Mr. J. F. Mason (Windsor) 1426
Mr. Birrell 1426
Mr. Walter Long 1427
Mr. Moore 1427
Mr. Moore 1428
Mr. Cherry 1428
Viscount Castlereagh 1429

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. O'Shee 1429

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 22, after the word 'tenants,' to insert the words 'and new tenant purchasers.' "—(*Mr. O'Shee.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Page
Mr. T. M. Healy 1433
Mr. Butcher 1433
Mr. Power (Waterford, W.) 1435
Mr. Cherry 1435
Mr. T. M. Healy 1436
Mr. James Campbell 1438
Mr. Charles Craig 1442
Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.) 1443
Mr. Birrell 1444
Mr. Walter Long 1445
Mr. Moore 1447
Mr. John Redmond 1451
The Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland (Mr. T. W. Russell, Tyrone, S.) 1454
Mr. Walter Long 1456
Mr. Moore 1456
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 1457

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 87 ; Noes, 298. (Division List No. 302.)

And, it being after half-past Ten of the clock, the CHAIRMAN proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of 22nd July, successively to put forthwith the Questions necessary to dispose of the business to be concluded.

Question put, ": That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 341 ; Noes, 98. (Division List No. 303.)

Clause 2 :—

Verbal Amendment made.

Question put, " That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 346 ; Noes, 104. (Division List No. 304.)

Whereupon the CHAIRMAN left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again To-morrow.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) [EXPENSES].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys provided by Parliament, of expenses incurred and compensation payable by the Estates Commissioners in relation to land acquired under any Act of the present session, to facilitate the provision of land for certain Evicted Tenants in Ireland, and for other purposes connected therewith, and to authorise the National Debt Commissioners to make advances to the Land Commission for certain purposes of such Act."—*Mr. Birrell.*)

And, it being after half-past Ten of the clock, the Chairman proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of 22nd July, to put forthwith the Question.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 331 ; Noes, 94. (Division List No. 305.)

Resolution to be reported To-morrow 1471

Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill (By ORDER).—Order for consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill, as amended, be now considered."

Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 1475
Sir William Bull (Hammersmith) 1478

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words 'now considered,' and add the words 'recommitted to a Private Bill Committee'"—(*Sir Frederick Banbury*—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words 'now considered' stand part of the Question.'"

Mr. Waterlow (Islington, N.) 1478
The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 1482
Mr. Walter Long (Dublin, S.) 1485
Mr. Straus (Tower Hamlets, Mile End) 1487
Mr. Barnard (Kidderminster) 1487
Mr. Burdett-Coutts (Westminster) 1489
Mr. Luke White (Yorkshire, E.R., Buckrose) 1490

uestion put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 163 ; Noes, 53. Division List No. 306.)

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill, as amended, considered.

Mr. Fletcher (Hampstead) 1493
Mr. W. F. D. Smith (Strand, Westminster) 1494

New clause—

"Notwithstanding anything in this Act contained the water rates shall continue to be payable according to the annual value of the house or building, or part of a house or building, supplied with water by the Board, and such annual value shall (except within the unions and parishes to which The Valuation (Metropolis) Act, 1869, extends) be determined in accordance with the provisions of Section 68 of the Waterworks Clauses Act, 1847, and shall in no case be less than the rateable value according to the poor rate valuations."—(*Mr. Fletcher.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Whitbread (Huntingdonshire, Huntingdon) .. 1495
Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) .. 1497
Mr. F. E. Smith (Liverpool, Walton) .. 1497

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this debate be now adjourned."—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Mr. John Burns .. 1498

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 60 ; Noes, 125. (Division List No. 307.)

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. Dickinson (St. Pancras, N.) .. 1499
Mr. Barnard (Kidderminster) .. 1503
Mr. Waterlow .. 1505
Sir F. Banbury .. 1505
Mr. M'Kinnon Wood (Glasgow, St. Rollox) .. 1507
Mr. Luke White .. 1508
Mr. John Burns .. 1509
Mr. B. S. Straus .. 1511
Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.) .. 1513
Mr. Morton .. 1514
Sir John Bethell (Essex, Romford) .. 1516

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 64 ; Noes, 101. (Division List No. 308.)

Sir William Bull .. 1517

A new clause—

> "(1) If the receipts on revenue account exceed the expenditure on that account of the Board in any year, one-fourth of the excess shall, notwithstanding anything contained in the Act of 1902, be carried to a separate account in the books of the Board and ear-marked as applicable to the reduction of the charges for the time being made by the Board for supply of water by measure in pursuance of the section of this Act whereof the marginal note is 'Supply by measure'; (2) all moneys carried to a separate account and ear-marked in pursuance of Sub-section (1) of this section shall be accumulated from time to time until they amount to not less than two pounds ten shillings per centum upon the amount for one year of the charges to reduction of which they are applicable, and shall then be applied and distributed by way of a special discount or rebate upon such charges at a rate of not less than two pounds ten shillings per centum per annum.

July 24.] *Page*

Brought up and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question, "That the clause be read the second time," put, and negatived.

Mr. Cooper (Southwark, Bermondsey) 1520
Lord R. Cecil 1520

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, to leave out lines 24 and 25."—(*Mr. Cooper.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. John Burns 1521
Sir William Bull 1522
Mr. John Burns 1522
Mr. H. W. Forster (Kent, Sevenoaks) 1523
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. George Whiteley, Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey) 1524
Mr. John Burns 1524

Question put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed this day, at a quarter past Eight of the Clock.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn"—(*Mr. Whiteley*)—put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at twenty-one minutes before Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: WEDNESDAY, 24TH JULY, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill [H.L.]; Tynemouth Corporation (Water) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 1525

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3868. China (Pakhoi) 1525

RAILWAY EMPLOYMENT (SAFETY APPLIANCES).—Reports of the Committee appointed by the Board of Trade to examine and where necessary to test appliances designed to diminish danger to men employed in railway service, together with the appendices thereto 1525

Page

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).—Report by Dr. W. Leslie Mackenzie and Captain A. Foster on a collection of statistics as to the physical condition of children attending the public schools of the school board for Glasgow, with relative tables and diagrams.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1525

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Order of the day for Standing Order No. XXXIX. to be considered in order to its being suspended for this day's sitting; read, and discharged 1525

OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITIES.

The Lord Bishop of Birmingham 1526
The Lord Bishop of Bristol 1533
Lord Ellenborough 1539
The Lord Bishop of Hereford 1543
Lord Burghclere 1547
The Lord Bishop of Oxford 1549
The Lord President of the Council (*The Earl of Crewe*) 1551
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1555

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS.

The Earl of Donoughmore 1559

Moved, that there be laid upon the Table a Return giving—(1) The number and names of the evicted tenants already restored to holdings under the Act of 1903, the date of their eviction, a statement as to whether they were or were not Plan of Campaign tenants, whether they were judicial tenants or not, and the amount of arrears when they were evicted. (2) The number of those cases reported upon in which the applicant was considered suitable, and the number of such cases in which the Estate Commissioners heard evidence or acted on information other than that contained in the reports of their inspectors. (3) Of the 1,259 cases mentioned in paragraph 23 of the Estates Commissioners' Report on Evicted Tenants, dated 11th June, 1907, how many of the tenants now in possession of the holding from which the applicants have been evicted have been in possession for five, ten, and twenty years respectively.—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

Lord Denman 1560

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Moved, that there be laid before the House a Return giving—(1) The number and names of the evicted tenants already restored to holdings under the Act of 1903, the date of their eviction, a statement as to whether they were or were not Plan of Campaign tenants; (2) The number of those cases reported upon in which the applicant was considered suitable.—(*The Earl of Donoughmore*)—agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

House adjourned at quarter past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMOMNS: WEDNESDAY, 24TH JULY, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

North British Railway Bill [LORDS] (BY ORDER.)—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 1562

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to—Injured Animals Act (1894) Amendment Bill without Amendment; Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, Advertisements Regulation Bill, Sunderland Corporation Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to:—Ashton-under-Lyne, Stalybridge, and Dukinfield (District) Waterworks Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Law relating to the capacity of women to be elected and act as members of county or borough councils." [Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) Bill [Lords.]

And also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Aberdeen Corporation." [Aberdeen Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [Lords] 1652

Aberdeen Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; and ordered, under Section 9 of The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 285] 1562

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).—Copy presented, of Report by Dr. W. Leslie Mackenzie and Captain A. Foster on a collection of Statistics as to the physical condition of children attending the public schools of the School Board for Glasgow, with relative tables and diagrams (by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1562

RAILWAY EMPLOYMENT (SAFETY APPLIANCES).—Copies presented, of Reports of the Committee appointed by the Board of Trade to examine and, where necessary, to test appliances designed to diminish danger to men employed in railway service, together with the Appendices thereto [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1563

UNIVERSITY COLLEGES (GREAT BRITAIN) (GRANT IN AID).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 23rd of July; Mr. Runciman]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 267] 1563

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No. 3868 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1563

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Inspection of Balintore Harbour, Ross-shire.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Sinclair .. 1563

Housing of the Board of Agriculture.—Question, Mr. Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe); Answer, Mr. Harcourt .. 1563

Irish Landowners Refusing to Sell.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 1564

Cost of Royal Commission on Irish Department of Agriculture.—Question, Mr. Gwynn (Galway); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 1564

Application of Mr. Joseph Philpott.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 1564

Kerry Railway Guarantees.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 1565

Overcrowded Condition of Forthill Burying Ground.—Question, Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 1565

Australian Customs Duties on Goods Imported from the United Kingdom.—Question, Mr. J. D. White (Dumbartonshire); Answer, Mr. Churchill .. 1565

Re-organisation of the Colonial Audit Branch Staff.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 1566

Marylebone Council School—Appointment of Representative Managers. Question, Mr. Whitehead (Essex, S.E.); Answer, Mr. John Burns .. 1567

Value of Rateable Property in Scotland.—Question, Mr. Menzies (Lanarkshire, (S.); Answer, Mr. Sinclair .. 1568

Desertions from British Cruisers when Visiting America.—Question, Mr. Lane-Fox (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson .. 1568

Blackpool New Post Office.—Question, Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool); Answer, Mr. Harcourt .. 1568

Delay in Payment of Gurkha Police in Eastern Bengal.—Question, Sir mour King (Hull, Central); Answer, Mr. Morley .. 1569

Salaries and Emoluments of Staff Officers.—Question, Viscount Castlereagh (Maidstone); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 1569

Army Clothing Contracts placed in Scotland.—Question, Mr. Watt (Glasgow College); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 1569

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Destroyers in the Mediterranean.—Question, Mr. Austen Chamberlain (Worceste shire, E.); Answer, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Lambert, Devonshire, South Molton) .. 1570

June 24.] Page

NAVAL BARRACKS.—Question, Mr. Beauchamp (Suffolk, Lowestoft); Answer, Mr. Lambert 1570

CHANNEL DESTROYER FLOTILLA.—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Lambert 1570

H.M.S. "NEW ZEALAND."—Question, Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow); Answer, Mr. Lambert 1571

H.M.S. "CUMBERLAND."—Question, Mr. Hunt; Answer, Mr. Lambert 1571

THE COASTGUARD.—Question, Mr. Mildmay (Devonshire, Totnes); Answer, Mr. Lambert 1571

BATTLESHIP ARMAMENTS.—Question, Mr. Gretton (Rutland): Answer, Mr. Lambert 1571

DEFENCE OF HOME WATERS.—Question, Mr. Bellairs, Mr. H. J. Craig (Tynemouth), Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answers, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lambert, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.) 1572

"KING EDWARD VII.'s" DEFECTIVE RUDDER.—Questions, Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.), Mr. A. Dewar (Edinburgh, S.); Answer, Mr. Lambert 1573

H.M.S. "RINGDOVE."—Question, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.); Answer, Mr. Lambert 1574

SCOTTISH COASTGUARD.—Question, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; Answer, Mr. Lambert 1575

SMOKELESS BLANK CARTRIDGE FOR ARTILLERY.—Question, Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford); Answer, the Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Buchanan, Perthshire, E.) 1575

BRITISH COLONIAL SHOOTING TEAM.—Question, Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye); Answer, Mr. Buchanan 1576

BURMA RAILWAYS.—Question, Mr. Lea; Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for India (Mr. Charles Hobhouse, Bristol, E.) 1576

INDIAN RUPEE COINAGE.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Charles Hobhouse 1577

TRANSVAAL LABOUR ORDINANCE.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 1577

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Dr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1578

ASSAULT BY NATAL PLANTER ON A COOLIE.—Dr. Rutherford; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1578

MR. CHURCHILL'S VACATION TOUR.—Questions, Sir Gilbert Parker, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs), Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.), Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Trasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 1579

Page

THE HAGUE CONFERENCE.—Question, Mr. King (Cheshire, Knutsford); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury), for Sir E. Greey 1580

COMPANY LAW IN GUERNSEY.—Question, Mr. H. H. Marks (Kent, Thanet); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 1580

WELSHPOOL CEMETERY SCANDAL.—Questions, Mr. Osmond Williams (Merionethshire , Mr. Rees; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 1581

HUNGERFORD JUSTICES' CLERK.—Question, Mr. Morton (Sutherland); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1582

CHAINED PRISONERS.—Questions, Mr. Hazleton (Galway, N.), Mr. Swift MacNeill, Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1582

WAGE STATISTICS.—Questions, Mr. T. Davies (Fulham) Mr. Chiozza-Money (Paddington, N.); Answers, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 1583

SCHOOL BUILDING GRANTS.—Question, Mr. Gretton (Rutland); Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Mr. Lough, Islington, W.) 1584

LAND TAX COMMISSIONERS.—Question, Mr. Gretton; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 1586

THE PUBLIC TRUSTEE.—Question, Mr. Bottomley (Hackney, S.); Answer, The Attorney-General (Sir John Walton, Leeds, S.) 1585

SCOTTISH FISHERIES PROTECTION.—Question, Mr. Morton, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 1585

SCOTTISH VALUATION.—Question, Mr. Menzies (Lanarkshire, S.); Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. Thomas Shaw, Hawick Burghs) 1586

SCOTTISH PUBLIC PARKS.—Question, Mr. Watt (Glasgow, College); Answer, Mr. Thomas Shaw 1586

IRISH HORSE BREEDING.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answer, The Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland (Mr. T. W. Russell, Tyrone, S.) 1587

KANTURK GUARDIANS AND THE NEWMARKET EXTRA POLICE TAX.—Questions, Mr. Flynn, Mr. O'Shee (Waterford, W.); Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 1587

FERMOY RELIEVING OFFICER.—Question, Captain Craig (Down, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1589

J. W. LEAHY ESTATE NEAR CAHIRCIVEEN.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1590

IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1591

IRISH INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 1591

June 24.] *Page*

KILKISHEN EVICTED TENANT.—Questions, Mr. Halpin (Clare, W.), Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1591

IRISH EDUCATION RULES.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 1591

IRVINE ESTATE EVICTED TENANT.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1593

CATTLE MUTILATION ON THE KENMARE ESTATE.—Question, Captain Craig; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1593

COLEMANSTOWN EVICTED TENANT.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1594

MR. CONOR O'KELLY'S ARHAGH SPEECH.—Question, Mr. Charles Craig; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1594

LADY OSBORNE'S NENAGH TENANTRY.—Question, Mr. Hogan (Tipperary, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1595

EDUCATION GRANTS.—Question, Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1595

KENMARE ESTATE EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1596

MR. GINNELL'S SPEECH.—Question, Mr. Charles Craig; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 1596

INTERNATIONAL DISARMAMENT.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1597

THE AYRSHIRE FOUNDRY COMPANY.—Quesiton, Mr. Lea; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1597

VAGRANCY LAW.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1598

ALLEGED SALES OF PEERAGES.—Question, Mr. Lea; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1598

EARL OF CROMER—MESSAGE FROM THE KING.

EDWARD REX.

His Majesty, taking into consideration the eminent services rendered by the Earl of Cromer, O.M., G.C.B., G.C.M.G., K.C.S.I., C.I.E., formerly Agent and Consul-General in Egypt, and being desirous in recognition of such services to confer upon him some signal mark of His favour, recommends to His faithful Commons that He should be enabled to grant Lord Cromer the sum of £50,000.

Ordered, "That His Majesty's Most Gracious Message be referred to the Committee of Supply."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) 1599

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C (in respect of the Small

Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. George White; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. Beck.

Report to lie upon the Table 1600

Prohibition of Medical Practice by Companies Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 284] 1600

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill.—Lords' Amendment to be considered upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 286] 1600

Advertisements Regulation Bill.—Lords' Amendments to be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 287] 1600

Finance Bill.—As amended, to be printed. [Bill 288] 1600

Limited Partnerships Bill.—Lords' Amendments to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 289] 1600

NEW BILL.

State Reformatories Bill.—"To provide for the detention in State Reformatories of young persons convicted of indictable offences, and for purposes incidental thereto," presented by Mr. Secretary Gladstone; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 290] .. 1600

EVICTED TNEANTS (IRELAND) [EXPENSES].

Resolution reported, "That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys provided by Parliament, of expenses incurred and compensation payable by the Estates Commissioners in relation to land acquired under any Act of the present session, to facilitate the provision of land for certain evicted tenants in Ireland, and for other purposes connected therewith, and to authorise to National Debt Commissioners to make advances to the Land Commission for certain purposes of such Act."

Resolution agreed to 1601

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Mr. Moore (*Armagh, N.*) 1601
Mr. Charles Craig (*Antrim, S.*) 1603

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 28, after the word 'tenant' to insert the words 'and all persons interested.'"—(*Mr. Charles Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool, Exchange) .. 1604
Mr. Moore 1604
Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.) 1605
Mr. James Campbell (Dublin University) 1605
Mr. Charles Craig 1606
Colonel Kenyon-Slaney (Shropshire, Newport) 1607
Mr. Moore 1609
Mr. Cherry 1610
Mr. Charles Craig 1610

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 62 ; Noes, 274. (Division List No. 309.)

Mr. Charles Craig 1615

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 10, to leave out the word 'six," and insert the word 'twelve.' "—(*Mr. Charles Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'six' stand part of the clause."

Mr. Birrell 1615
Mr. Moore 1617
Colonel Kenyon-Slaney 1617
Mr. James Campbell 1617
Mr. T. M. Healy 1618
Mr. Cherry 1618
Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.) 1619
Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool) 1619
Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 1620
Mr. Lambton (Durham, S.E.) 1622
Mr. T. M. Healy 1622
Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.) 1621
Mr. Charles Craig 1621
Mr. Cherry 1624
Mr. Moore 1625

Question put.
The Committee divided :—Ayes, 291 ; Noes, 69. (Division List No. 310.)

Mr. Moore 1629

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 31, to leave out the words 'service thereof,' and insert the words 'gale day next after the service of such notice.' "—*Mr. Moore*).

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Birrell 1630

July 24.] *Page*

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 301 ; Noes, 73. (Division List No. 311.)

Mr. Moore 1635

Amendment proposed—

" In page 3, line 31, at the end of Sub-section (1) to insert the words ' Provided that such notice shall be served within three years after the land has been acquired.' "—(*Mr. Moore.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Birrell 1635
Mr. Walter Long 1636
Mr. Barrie 1638
Mr. Clancy 1639
Mr. Charles Craig 1639
Sir C. Hill (Shrewsbury) 1642
Mr. T. L. Corbett 1642
Mr. James Campbell 1643
Mr. T. M. Healy 1645

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 70 ; Noes, 292. (Division List No. 312.)

Mr. Ashley 1651

Amendment proposed—

" In page 3, line 32 and 33, to leave out the words ' on or before the aforesaid date,' and insert the words ' within three months from the services of the aforesaid notice.' "—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question proposed, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Birrell 1651

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Power (Waterford, E.) 1652

Amendment proposed—

" In page 3, line 39, after the word ' which,' to insert the words ' in the opinion of the said Commissioners.' "—(*Mr. Power.*)

Wuestion proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Cherry 1653
Mr. Charles Craig 1653
Mr. T. L. Corbett 1654

July 24.]

Page

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Dyes, 264 ; Noes, 57. (Division List No. 313.)

Mr. Ashley 1657

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 4, line 2 and 3, to leave out the words 'the Estates Commissioners,' and insert the words 'a court of arbitration shall be appointed as in the schedule to The Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act, 1870, mentioned and.' "—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Birrell 1658
Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 1661
Mr. Cherry 1663
Mr. Walter Long 1664
Mr. Moore 1666
Mr. T. M. Healy 1669
Mr. Barrie 1670
Mr. Charles Craig 1671
Mr. T. L. Corbett 1674

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 272 ; Noes, 51. (Division List No. 314.

Mr. Moore 1677

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 4, line 4, after the word 'heard,' to insert the words 'offer him another parcel of land which shall be suitable and in the event of his refusal of such parcel shall.' "—(*Mr. Moore.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. T. M. Healy 1679
Mr. Charles Craig 1680
Mr. Cherry 1680
Mr. Moore 1681
Colonel Kenyon-Slaney 1682
Mr. T. M. Healy 1684

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 85 ; Noes, 331. (Division List No. 315.)

And, it being after half-past Ten of the clock, the Chairman proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 22nd July, successively to put forthwith the Questions on the Amendments moved by the Government of which notice had been given, and the Questions necessary to dispose of the Business to be concluded.

Question put, " That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 336 ; Noes 83. (Division List No. 316.)

Clause 4 :—

Amendments made—

> " In page 4, line 28, after the word ' under,' to insert the words ' the foregoing provisions of.' "

> " In page 4, line 30, at the end, to add, ' (3) All costs and expenses in the opinion of the Judicial Commissioner necessarily and properly incurred by any petitioner in respect of a petition under this Act, or by any new tenant on a hearing before the Estates Commissioners, or by any person having a claim upon the purchase money of land acquired under this Act in the ascertainment of the title to and distribution of that money, shall be paid as part of the expenses of the Land Commission to the person who incurred such costs or expenses.' "—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Question put, " That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 336 : Noes, 83. (Division List No. 317.)

Clause 5 :—

Amendment made—

> " In page 4, line 40, at the end, to add the words, ' in redemption of an equal amount of the original advance.' "—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Question put, " That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 332 ; Noes 83 (Division List No. 318.)

Clauses 6 and 7 agreed to.

Clause 8 :—

Amendment made—

> " In page 5, line 22, at the end, to add, ' (2) No holding purchased by an evicted tenant, whether under the Act of 1903, or this Act, shall be made available in any bankruptcy, or by any process or proceeding of law, to pay, satisfy, or discharge, in whole or in part, any debt contracted or incurred by such evicted tenant prior to the date of the order vesting such holding in him.' "—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Clause 8, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 9 :—

Question put, " That the clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 329 ; Noes, 80 (Division List No. 319.)

Clause 10 :—

Question put, " That the clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 328 ; Noes, 78. (Division List No. 320.)

Clause 11 :—

Amendment made—

" In page 5, line 36, after the word 'agreement,' to insert the words 'and the provisions of section fourteen of the Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1887, with respect to money paid into the Bank of Ireland shall apply where money is so paid under this Act."—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Question, " That Clause 11, as amended, stand part of the Bill," put, and agreed to.

Clause 12 :—

Amendment made—

" In page 6, line 2, leave out from the word 'as,' to end of line 4, and insert the words 'if they were county court judges in Ireland.' " —(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Question put, " That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 312 ; Noes, 75. (Division List No. 321.)

Clause 13 :—

Amendment made—

" In page 6, line 18, at end, to add the words '(2) The annuity payable in respect of an advance made in pursuance of this section shall, in accordance with regulations made by the Treasury, be consolidated and made payable with the purchase annuity payable in respect of the durchase money of the parcel of land.' "—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Question put, " That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 315 ; Noes, 71, (Division List No. 322.)

Clause 14 —

Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 302 ; Noes, 71. (Division List No. 323.)

Bill reported ; as amended, to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 290.]

Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill (By Order.)

As amended, considered.

Mr. Claude Hay (*Shoreditch, Hoxton*) 1723
Mr. Stuart Wortley (*Sheffield, Hallam*) 1723

New clause—

"(1) In constructing laying down altering improving enlarging extending maintaining repairing renewing or removing any conduits main pipes wires appliances apparatus or other works in exercise of any of the powers conferred by this Act or by any of the Acts incorporated wholly or partly therewith upon along across under or over the railways works lands or property of the railway companies or under over or across any level crossing over any such railway or under over across or in any way affecting the structure of any bridge or tunnel over or under such railways or the approaches to or roads over any such bridge or tunnel or anyother road which the railway companies are or may be liable to maintain the same shall be done under the superintendence and to the reasonable satisfaction of the chief engineer of the railway company whose railways bridges tunnels works lands or other property or level crossing may be affected or by whom any such road is liable to be maintained (in this section called 'the engineer') and in accordance with plans specifications sections and detailed drawings (in this section referred to as 'the plans') previously submitted to and approved in writing by the engineer or in case of difference settled by arbitration in manner hereinafter provided. Provided that if the engineer shall not within twenty-eight days after the plans shall have been submitted for his approval notify to the Board in writing his disapproval thereof he shall be deemed to have approved the plans ;

"(2) All such works shall be done by and at the expense of the Board who shall also make good and restore to the reasonable satisfaction of the engineer any property or works of the railway companies or any roads liable to be maintained by them affected by such works and shall to the like satisfaction maintain such roads (so far as the same may have been interfered with by the execution of such works) for three months after such restoration and for such further time (if any) not being more than twelve months in the whole as such roads shall continue to subside ;

"(3) All such works and any matters incidental to or connected therewith shall be done and carried out by the Board at such times and in such manner as the engineer may reasonably direct and so as to cause as little injury as may be to the railways bridges tunnels works lands and property of the railway companies or to any road which such companies may be liable to maintain ;

"(4) In the execution of any such works or incidental matters the Board shall not at any time or in any manner cause any injury or danger or (so far as can be avoided) any interruption impediment or delay to the safe passage and conduct of traffic over the railways or at to or from the stations sidings or works of the railway companies ;

"(5) If any such injury danger interruption impediment or delay shall be caused by or be attributable to any of such works or incidental matters or by or to the acts or defaults of the Board or their officers servants contractors or workmen or any other person employed in connection with such works or by or to the failure of any such works (such injury danger interruption impediment or delay not being the result of inevitable accident) the Board shall indemnify and save harmless the railway companies from all and any calims and demands which may be made upon the railway companies in connection with such injury danger interruption impediment delay or failure and shall also make compensation to the railway companies in respect of any loss or injury which they may sustain or any expense to which they may be put in connection with any such injury danger interruption impediment delay or failure and the amount of such compensation shall in case of difference be settled by arbitration in the manner hereinafter provided : Provided that in the case of the exercise by the Board of the powers of the section of this Act of which the marginal note is 'Power to Board to exercise powers of Local Authorities under Public Health Act, 1875' this subsection shall apply instead of Section 308 of 'The Public Health Act, 1875;'

"(6) Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act or any Act incorporated wholly or partly therewith the Board shall not without the consent in writing of the railway companies under their common seal purchase or acquire any of the lands or property of the railway companies but the Board may acquire and the railway companies shall if required grant to the Board an easement or right of constructing and maintaining works on through in under over or along such lands and property and the sum to be paid for the acquisition of such easement or right shall be settled in the manner provided by 'The Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845' with respect to the purchase of lands otherwise than by agreement. Provided always that where the Board shall have acquired any such easement or right as aforesaid nothing in this Act shall prevent the railway companies from using their lands and property as they may think fit subject to such reasonable protection for the works of the Board as may be agreed or settled by arbitration in manner hereinafter provided ;

"(7) The Board shall so construct maintain and work any wires and apparatus for the transmission of messages or reservoir level indications by means of electricity which they may establish under the powers of this Act as not to interfere with the working of any telephone telegraph train signalling or other apparatus of the railway companies by any stray currents induction or contacts and if any such interference shall take place the railway companies shall be at liberty to construct and provide an insulated return to the circuits affected by such interference or to do such other works as may be reasonably necessary and the Board shall on demand pay to the railway companies the reasonable cost of constructing and providing such insulated return or of such other necessary works as aforesaid;

"(8) The railway companies may if they so elect to do themselves carry out at the cost charges and expenses of the Board any works upon in under across or affecting their railways lands works or property except the provision of pipes and laying and jointing the same which shall be done by the Board;

"(9) If the railway companies at any time or times hereafter require (of which they shall be the sole judges) to adapt their railways or any part or parts thereof for working by electrical power or to construct any additional or other works upon their lands or railways or in connection therewith or to widen alter reconstruct or repair their railways bridges tunnels subways viaducts or works upon across over or under which any of the works of the Board may have been constructed or laid or if at any time or times hereafter a bridge shall be constructed in substitution for a level crossing upon across over or under which any of the works of the Board may have been constructed or laid the railway companies may, on giving to the Board twenty-eight days' notice in writing under the hand of their secretary or general manager of their intention so to do and in case of emergency (of which the engineer shall be the sole judge) without notice at their own expense divert alter support or carry over or under their railways lands works or property at any other point doing as little damage as may be and without being liable to pay compensation in respect of such diversion alteration supporting or carrying such works. Provided always that such diversion or alteration shall be done without unduly interfering with the supply of water by the Board;

"(10) In the execution or alteration by the railway companies of any works of the Board under either of the two last preceding subsections the same shall be done under the superintendence and to the reasonable satisfaction of the engineer to the Board and in accordance with plans specifications sections and detailed drawings previously submitted to and approved in writing by the said engineer or in case of difference settled by arbitration in manner hereinafter provided and if the said engineer shall not within twenty-eight days after the said plans specifications sections and detailed drawings shall have been submitted for his approval notify to the railway companies in writing his disapproval of the same he shall be deemed to have approved thereof and the railway companies shall not at any time or in any manner cause any avoidable interruption in the supply of water by the Board and if any such interruption shall be caused by or be attributable to the works of the railway companies or to the acts or defaults of such companies or their officers servants contractors or workmen or any other person employed in connection with such works or from the failure of any such works the railway companies shall indemnify and save harmless the Board from all and any claims and demands which may be made upon the Board in connection with such interruption and shall also make compensation to the Board in respect of any loss or injury which they may sustain or any expense to which they may be put in connection with such interruption and the amount of such compensation shall in case of difference be settled by arbitration in the manner hereinafter provided ;

"(11) If having regard to the proposed position of any work to be executed by the Board in relation to the position of the works of the railway companies at any point where the works of the Board will be constructed over under or along any railways or works of the railway companies it becomes reasonably necessary that any of the works of the railway companies should be altered the railway companies may execute the works reasonably necessary for such alteration and the reasonable costs of executing such works shall be repaid by the Board to the railway companies.

"(12) Nothing in this Act contained shall enable the Board to raise sink remove or otherwise alter the position of any railway sidings embankments bridges tunnels stations and works of a similar character belonging to the railway companies ;

"(13) If by reason of the execution of any of the works of the Board it shall become necessary to reconstruct alter strengthen or in anywise interfere with the structure of any bridge tunnel or other work of the railway companies such alteration reconstruction or strengthening shall be carried out by the railway companies at such times and in such manner as they may reasonably think expedient or necessary and the reasonable cost thereof shall be borne by the Board ;

"(14) The Board shall bear and on demand pay to the railway companies affected by the construction laying down alteration improvement enlargement extension maintenance renewal or removal of or the execution of repairs to any works of the Board all reasonable costs of the superintendence by the railway companies of the said works and repairs and of watching lighting and protection of the railways and works of the railway companies with reference to and during such works or repairs but such superintendence shall not relieve the Board from liability for any accidents which may be occasioned by or through any act or default of the Board or any contractors agent or workman or other person or persons employed in or about the execution and carrying out of such works or repairs ;

"(15) Any dispute or difference which may arise between the railway companies and the Board with reference to the provisions of this section or in any way arising thereout or as to any works to be carried out by the Board or by the railway companies shall be settled by arbitration by an engineer or other fit person to be agreed upon between them or failing such agreement to be appointed by the President of the Institution of Civil Engineers on the application of the railway companies and the Board or either of them"

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this Clause be read a second time."

Mr. Luke White (Yorkshire, E.R., Buckrose) 1728
The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 1729
Mr. Clement Edwards (Denbigh Districts) 1732
Mr. C. Duncan (Barrow-in-Furness) 1733
Sir J. Randles (Cumberland, Cockermouth) 1734
Mr. Dickinson (St. Pancras. N.) 1735
Colonel R. Williams (Dorsetshire, W.) 1737
Mr. Helme (Lancashire, Lancaster) 1739
Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham) 1740
Sir Edwin Cornwall (Bethnal Green, N.E.) 1741
Mr. Waterlow (Islington, N.) 1742
Mr. Ainsworth (Argyllshire) 1743

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 61 ; Noes, 44. (Dvision List No. 324.)

Dr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford) 1743

New Clause—"For the benefit and protection of the Heston and Isleworth and Twickenham Urban District Councils (in this section called or referred to as 'the Urban District Councils'), the following provisions shall, notwithstanding anything in this Act contained or shown on the deposited plans and sections, unless otherwise agreed to in writing between the councils and the Board, have effect (that is to say) :—(*a*) The Board shall not commence any of the said works to be executed by them so far as they affect any of the roads, footpaths, ways, sewers, drains, surface-water culverts, and water-courses belonging to or under the control of either of the said urban district councils until they shall have given to such urban district council at least twenty-one days' notice in writing of their intention to commence the same, by leaving the notice at the office for the time being of the clerk to such urban district council, with plans and sections of the said works, nor until such urban district council shall have signified its approval of the same, unless the said urban district council shall fail to signify in writing to the Board its approval or disapproval within twenty-one days after service of the said notice and delivery of the said plans and sections, in which event the Board may proceed forthwith with the said works in accordance with the said plans and sections, and in case, after such disapproval has been signified as aforesaid, any such plans and sections are not agreed upon, any difference between the Board and the said urban district council or councils with reference to the matters aforesaid shall be determined by arbitration as hereinafter provided ; (*b*) Where the surface of any street or foothpath or public place has been interfered with or disturbed by the Board in constructing the work or performing the operations by this Act authorised, the Board shall forthwith well and sufficiently and to the reasonable satisfaction of such urban district council having control of the same, or its surveyor, restore the surfaces so interfered with or disturbed, and shall make good and repair for one year from any such restoration any sinking or subsidence of such street or footpath

July 24.]

caused by the execution of the said works: (*c*) No part of the works by this Act authorised shall unnecessarily interfere with the sewers, drains, or watercourses of or under the control of either of the urban district councils, and shall be so constructed that the upper surface of the conduits, mains or lines of pipes shall throughout the entire length where they respectively pass through the lands, roads, or ways of such urban district council be not less than two feet below the present surface of the ground; (*d*) The Board shall not without the consent of the urban district council having the control and management of any street referred to in Section 14 of this Act in any way during the progress of the works by this Act authorised stop, or impede, or obstruct the public traffic passing along more than one-half the width of any such street for a greater length than 100 yards at one time, and shall in the execution of such works comply with and conform to all reasonable directions and regulations of any such urban district council in reference to such interference with the said street footpaths or public places and the traffic; (*e*) No sewer drain gas or other main or pipe of or under the control of either of the urban district councils shall be raised sunk or otherwise altered in position so as to impair the efficiency of such sewer drain gas or other main or pipe, or of any existing connection therewith, or so as to interfere with or increase the cost of any connection which may hereafter require to be made to such sewer drain gas or other main or pipe by the owners or occupiers of any lands or premises in the district of either of such urban district councils; (*f*) The Board shall from time to time and within six months from the time at which any new conduits mains, or lines of pipes authorised by this Act shall have been laid down or formed by the Board within the district of any urban district council cause a map or plan to be made on a scale not more than 88 feet to the inch, and shall cause to be marked thereon the course and situation of such conduits, mains, or lines of pipes within the respective urban district council's district, and shall within six months from the making of any alterations or additions cause such map or plan to be from time to time corrected and such additions made thereto as may show the altered line and situation of such conduits, mains, or lines of pipes, and a copy of such map or plan with the date expressed thereon of the last time when the same shall have been so corrected as aforesaid shall be deposited at the offices of the respective urban district councils within one month from the making of such map or plan or any additions, alterations, or deviations; (*g*) Nothing in this Act shall take away or abridge any powers to open or break up any road along or across which any aqueducts, conduits, or lines of pipes for conveying water are laid, or any other power vested in any such urban district council for any of the purposes for which such urban district councils are respectively constituted, for the purpose of laying down, repairing, altering, or removing, any pipes, drains, or sewers, or any tubes, wires, or apparatus for electric lighting, telegraphic, or other purposes, but in the exercise of such power every such urban district council shall be subject to the following restrictions (that is to say):—(1) They shall cause as little detriment or inconvenience to the Board as circumstances admit; (2) Before they commence any work whereby the flow of water along any aqueduct, conduit, or lines of pipes will be interrupted they shall (except in cases of urgency, in which cases no notice shall be necessary) give to the Board notice of their inten tion to commencesuch work, specifying the time at which they will begin to do so, such notice to be given seven days at least before the commencement of the work; (3) They shall not be liable to pay to the Board any compensation for injury done to the aqueducts, conduits, or lines of pipes for conveying water by the execution of such work, or for the reasonable exercise of the powers so vested in them as aforesaid; (4) Whenever, for the purpose of enabling them to execute such work, either of the urban district councils shall so require, the Board shall either stop the flow of water along the aqueduct, conduit, or lines of pipes to which the notice shall refer, where it would otherwise interfere with such work, or shore up and secure the same at their own risk and cost during the execution of the work there: Provided that such work shall always be completed by the urban district councils, or either of them, with all reasonable expedition; (5) Neither of the urban district councils shall execute such work, so far as it immediately affects the aqueducts, conduits, or lines of pipes, except under the superintendence of the Board, unless they refuse or neglect to give such superintendence at the time specified in the notice for the commencement of the work, or discontinue the same during the progress of the work, and they shall execute such work at their own expense and to the reasonable satisfaction of the Board: Provided that any additional expense imposed upon any urban district council by reason of the existence of the aqueducts conduits, or lines of pipes in any road or place where any such pipes, drains or sewers, tubes, wires, or apparatus shall have been laid before the construction of such aqueducts, conduits, or lines of pipes for conveying water shall be borne by the Board."

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Luke White 1749

Motion and clause, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 22, lines 11 and 12, to leave out the words 'of water supply,' and to insert the words 'from which the Board are for the time being authorised to take water.';"

"In page 22, line 12 after the word 'their,' to insert the word 'authorised.'"

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. Keswick (Surrey, Epsom) 1750
Mr. Claude Hay 1751

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out Clause 36."

Mr. Luke White 1751

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

July 12.] *Page*

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill to be read the third time.

Public Health Bill.—Order for consideration, as amended (by the Standing Committee), read.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Bill be re-committed to the former Committee"—(*Mr. Harmood-Banner*)—put, and agreed to. 1752

And, it being after half-past Eleven of the clock on Wednesday evening, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Two o'clock.

END OF TABLE OF CONTENTS TO VOL. CLXXVIII.

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(*AUTHORISED EDITION*)

IN THE

SECOND SESSION OF THE *TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT* OF THE UNITED
KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*, APPOINTED TO MEET
THE TWELFTH DAY OF FEBRUARY IN THE SEVENTH YEAR OF THE
REIGN OF

HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD VII.

TENTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1907.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 11*th July*, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the followings Bills have been complied with:—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3). Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13).

The same were ordered to lie upon the Table.

London United Tramways Bill. Read 3ª, and passed.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; (Fleetwood Victoria Pier Order). Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.].

Amendments reported (according to order); and Bills to be read 3ª on Monday next.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

INDIAN (TEXTILE FACTORIES).

Report of the Textile Factories Labour Committee, appointed by the Government of India December, 1906, to inquire into the conditions of factory labour in India; with Appendices.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3856. United States (Philadelphia).

JUDICIAL STATISTICS (IRELAND), 1906.

Part II. Civil Statistics.

VOL. CLXXVIII. [FOURTH SERIES.]

OLD-AGE PENSIONS.

Tables which have been prepared in connection with the question of old-age pensions, with a preliminary memorandum.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

QUALIFICATION OF WOMEN (COUNTY AND BOROUGH COUNCILS) BILL. [H.L.]

House in Committee (according to order).

[The Earl of ONSLOW in the Chair.]

Clause 1 :—

LORD MONK BRETTON moved an Amendment which, while enabling women to be elected aldermen, would prevent them from being elected as councillors. He reminded their Lordships that the Lord President of the Council in introducing the Bill described it as a modest measure, whereas the Leader of the Opposition had pointed out that all the arguments which had been urged in its favour might equally apply in regard to the Parliamentary suffrage. Whether or not the noble Earl considered the Bill was an instalment of woman suffrage, he thought it would be agreed that the woman suffrage party in the country regarded it as an important measure, a conclusion which was borne out by the position it had been given in the Press. It was a curious thing that a Bill which actually did so little should attract so much attention, particularly when they had the example of the urban district councils before them, and found that on the urban district councils, which were the bodies most nearly resembling the county and borough councils, only two ladies in the whole of England and Wales sat as members. Whatever its object, the Bill would give a considerable impetus to the woman suffrage movement, and because he thought his Amendment an important one from that point of view, he desired to say a word on the broader question. The effect of woman suffrage in Australia had been to create a great disproportion in the representation of the different classes. It had been found there that the women's votes practically doubled the vote of the Independent Labour Party, while it added only a comparatively small fraction to the vote of the upper classes, and a very small fraction to the vote of the middle classes. That tendency would be still more marked in this country, where the middle classes were far more numerous than in Australia. He did not wish in any way to suggest that they should strike a blow at the Independent Labour Party; he merely drew attention to the injustice of the disproportionate representation. He regretted that Lord Belper's suggestion for a Select Committee to inquire into the use of ladies on borough and county councils had not been accepted, as there was the greatest diversity in the various local bodies. In the recent debate Lord Londonderry had said that he knew a case in which a lady member of a board of guardians had been of great assistance, inasmuch as she had discovered that a child had no socks on inside its boots. That doubtless was a very useful function as a guardian, but it was no qualification for a member of a town council. Lord Belper had gone very fully into the functions of the various committees of county and borough councils, and had clearly shown that with regard to county councils only the education committee, the asylums committee, and the sanitary committee were those on which ladies could be of service. They were already on the education committee by co-optation; they might be of use on the asylums committees in regard to female lunatics; while on the sanitary committee there was the one small branch of midwifery in connection with which they might be of service. On the finance and the standing joint committees ladies would be of no special service. In regard to borough councils, there were three functions concerning which ladies would be useful, namely: Infant Life Protection, the Housing of the Working Classes, and the Shop Acts. The arguments in favour of putting ladies on any other committees would equally apply to the Parliamentary franchise. He regretted that the proposed Select Committee had not been appointed inasmuch as it would have shown what use women could be on the various councils, and the desire or otherwise of those local bodies to have their assistance. Unfortunately, the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack declared that the reference of the Bill to a Select Committee would mean its loss for the session; consequently the proposal was not persisted in. It was in these circumstances he had decided to move his Amendment, under which county and borough councils would be enabled to obtain the advice of women on any of their committees. It would enable ladies who were members of the education committee to be co-opted on to the council, and thereby would meet the argument that ladies who had been allowed to state their views in committee should be enabled to reinforce them on the council. Further, county councils would be enabled to decide whether they wanted these ladies at all. One objection to the Amendment was that under the law as it stood, to be eligible for appointment as aldermen on county councils persons must be county electors. Therefore, the number of ladies who could be elected aldermen was very restricted. If, however, that was the only objection to the proposal, it would be very easy to surmount it, inasmuch as while the present clause was before the House it could be so amended as to enable county councils to elect as aldermen any ladies, whether electors or not. He believed that if the principle of the Amendment were agreed to, it would result in more ladies being elected to county and borough councils than would be the case under the Bill as it stood, as the number of ladies qualified to be councillors was very few, and consequently there would not be many aldermen elected. If the only way in which ladies could be elected to a county council was by being appointed aldermen, he thought the county councils would be much more likely to co-opt ladies who were now working on the education committees and to make use of them on other branches of their work. Therefore, the Amendment, reinforced by the further suggestion which he had made. would lead to far greater efficiency in the working of the Bill from the point of view of the Government itself. There was, however, one thing which such an Amendment would not do—it would in no way pander to the agitation in favour of universal suffrage. If their Lordships desired to amend the Bill for the purpose of improving the working of local authorities, it could be done in the way he suggested; but if they desired to pass the Bill in order to open the door a little more widely to the lady suffragists who were coming along, his Amendment would not help them.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 6, to leave out the words 'a councillor or,' and to insert the word 'an.'"—(*Lord Monk Bretton.*)

*THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Earl of CREWE): I hope the House will forgive me if I do not enter into the somewhat wider discussion to which the noble Lord devoted a part of his speech—a discussion which I think would have been more appropriate in some ways to a Motion for the rejection of the Bill on Second Reading. In particular I do not propose to follow the noble Lord in his remarks on the question of women and the Parliamentary suffrage. Several noble Lords, of whom I was one, explained on the Second Reading of the Bill we did not admit that there was any real analogy or connection between the two matters, and I have no desire to repeat what was said on that occasion. As regards the Amendment before the House, I trust your Lordships will not accept it. In the first place, the form of the Amendment would not, I think, carry out the noble Lord's object. His proposition is to leave out the words "a councillor or," the intention being that the only office upon either a county council or a borough council which could be filled by a woman should be that of an alderman. But at present nobody can be an alderman unless he can be a councillor. Therefore, by striking out the words which enable ladies to become councillors, the noble Lord would also prevent them being aldermen. That applies both to county councils and to metropolitan borough councils. This, however, deals only with the form, and no doubt the noble Lord could devise words which would achieve his object in a different way.

As regards the substance of the Amendment, I equally trust your Lordships will not accept it. The principal object for which I understand it is desired that women should be limited to the position of aldermen, is to avoid their being subjected to the turmoil of election. That argument was freely used on the last occasion when the question was before us. One would almost suppose that it was the custom in this country when municipal and county council elections were going on for barricades to be erected and cavalry charges to take place. In ninety-nine cases out of 100 these elections are of the most quiet and harmless character, and have very little rowdyism connected with them. So far as the feelings of women are concerned, you must leave it to them to say whether or not they are too nervous or too frightened to take part in such contests. The noble Lord alluded to the analogy of the urban district councils, and gave that as a reason for supposing that very few women would be elected to county or borough councils. If that is so, the noble Lord will, no doubt, be perfectly satisfied. He objects, apparently, to ladies getting on to these councils at all by election, and if they do not stand, or if they are not elected, the noble Lord's view will be largely carried out. But as regards the curiously small number of women who have been elected to urban district councils, there is this reason for supposing that this small number does not represent what might happen after this Bill passes, as I trust it may. An urban district always hopes to become a borough, and it tries to be as like a borough as possible. Women cannot sit on borough councils; therefore, there is a distinct indisposition on the part of urban district councils and those who elect them to stamp themselves as being in some way different from a borough council by electing woman members. I can well believe that this fact has had a considerable effect in limiting the possibility of women sitting on those particular bodies.

The noble Lord would limit the election of women to the position of aldermen—that is to say, only one-fourth of an ordinary council and only one-sixth of a London county or borough council being aldermen, the effect would be to reduce by three-fourths or five-sixths the possibility of women getting on to these councils. You have further to consider that you would limit it even more, because it is not proposed to increase the total number of aldermen, and the indisposition to stand for election so far as it exists at all applies also to a considerable number of men. There are always a certain number of men put on these councils as aldermen because they do not want to go through an election. Either those men would have to stand out because of women being put on or the women would not get on at all. Therefore the limitation is really greater than appears at first sight.

Another argument used was that the method proposed in the Amendment is the way to get the right kind of women on to these councils. There is nothing in the Bill as it stands to prevent women of the right kind being put on as aldermen, and I do not know what reason there is to suppose that the women who would stand for election would not be of the right kind. The women who went through the School Board elections, which were sometimes of a fairly animated character, were by common consent very much of the right kind. It is a very old argument—as old as the Reform Bill of 1832. It was always said that if you did away with the nomination boroughs you would do away with the chance of getting the right kind of men into the House of Commons. Whatever that argument may be worth, we now in all forms of government in this country rely to a very great extent upon the method of popular election. The noble Lord suggests that something might be done to enable women to be elected aldermen whether qualified to be councillors or not. That is a compromise we could not accept. It would be a very serious interference with the whole system of the franchise, and one which I do not think this House would be willing to make. It opens up a very wide question indeed. We simply stand on the ground if you once admit—and the House has undoubtedly admitted—that it is desirable that women should sit on these bodies, the burden of proof rests with those who decline to allow them to go through the ordinary methods of election. I do not believe that a very great number of women will stand or be elected to any of these councils, but if they desire to do so, I cannot conceive what sound reasons there are why they should not be permitted so to do.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: When this Bill was under discussion on a previous occasion I indicated to your Lordships—I hope with sufficient clearness—the reasons which led me to prefer, to the plan embodied in the Government Bill, the plan suggested by my noble friend Lord Belper—a plan under which women should be co-opted to a greater extent to committees connected with these municipal bodies. We deferred the further consideration of the measure for a considerable time partly in hopes of obtaining from the Local Government Board information which might serve to enlighten us upon the subject. That information has not been of a very satisfying kind, but in the meanwhile we have lost three weeks of the Session, and the position of the Bill would certainly become much more precarious if we were to insist on referring it to a Select Committee: the course recommended by Lord Belper. But quite irrespective of that, I am bound to say that, having paid some attention to the arguments which I have heard, both in and out of this House, I have come to the conclusion that the case in favour of the Government proposal is stronger than I had supposed it to be. If I may summarise what I conceive to be the argument in favour of the employment of women on these councils, I would say in the first place that women feel that the councils are constantly in the habit of varying and reviewing the decisions of their committees, and that therefore it does not follow that because they have been fully consulted in the committees they have any opportunity of following up in the council the advice they have given and of obtaining adequate consideration of their views. There is also this to be said, that the subjects in which women are so largely interested are discussed, not in one committee alone, but in a number of committees, and it is only when the matter comes before the whole council that it is possible to take a general and comprehensive view of them. In these circumstances women desire, and I think naturally, to be in closer contact at one end with the councils and at the other with those by whom the councils are elected. They also plead, and I think with force, that so long as they are merely co-opted to these committees, they are serving, as it were, on sufferance, and that their tenure of office is necessarily precarious. Therefore, I am not ashamed to confess that I am to a great extent a convert to the view embodied in the Government measure. I have said these few words because they seem to be a natural preface to what I have to say in regard to the Amendment of my noble friend. I feel that if this Bill is to be accepted, and if women are to be given a place upon the councils themselves, it would be an unwise and unfortunate restriction to say that they should serve only as aldermen. There is, of course, the technical difficulty which the Lord President has pointed out; but quite irrespective of that it is obvious that to say that women shall be able to serve as aldermen, but not as members of the councils, would be a very great curtailment of the rights to which they attach so much importance, and which this House, I believe, is ready to give them. For that reason if my noble friend presses his Amendment I shall with regret vote against him.

*THE EARL OF MALMESBURY said he would not have intervened but for the fact that that was the only opportunity which the thirty-three Members of their Lordships' House who voted against the Second Reading of the Bill had of endeavouring to make the situation as favourable as possible from their point of view. The number voting against the Second Reading would probably have been considerably larger had it not been for the expectation of the appointment of a Select Committee. He believed that the Amendment, if inserted, would go a long way to meet the views of many who were opposed to the Second Reading of the Bill. If the number of ladies now serving on county councils was not greatly increased, it was extremely probable that all those who were now co-opted members of committees would be elected as aldermen, and so have an opportunity of expressing their views at meetings of the whole council. A cogent reason why the Amendment should be accepted was the fact that a limitation was imposed upon what a lady might or might not do. Under the Bill she was to be allowed to be a councillor, but although she might have all the necessary qualifications she could not be a justice of the peace. As far as he could make out, there was no real mandate for the Bill; he believed the number of ladies who wished to serve on county and borough councils was exceedingly small, and that those who had that wish had raised a very loud cry. He was asked the other day by a lady who was strongly opposed to the principles embodied in the Bill why the House of Lords had taken such a favourable view of the measure; and this lady answered herself by saying that she supposed they were afraid that the gentle sex would repeat those persuasive measures which they had adopted in another place. He hoped their Lordships would not be deterred from voting for the Amendment even though they took the risk of having their proceedings disturbed as had been the case elsewhere.

LORD JAMES OF HEREFORD said he was unwilling to come into conflict with both Front Benches, and perhaps it was rather a hopeless thing to do, but he wished particularly to express his view that those who opposed the Bill ought not to take up a *non possumus* attitude, but should accept the decision of the House in favour of the Second Reading of the Bill. He thought, however, that the discussion afforded justification for those who wished the Bill to be remitted to a Select Committee. Several matters had been raised which might, with advantage, have been thrashed out before a Select Committee. Those who opposed the extension of the Parliamentary suffrage to women did not in the least wish to hinder or restrict the good and efficient work of women in municipal affairs. So long as the majority of the children in the schools were girls, women ought to be allowed to assist in the educational arrangements. So long as under the Poor Law there were more female paupers than male, it was an advantage that boards of guardians should have the assistance of women. He only desired to see the utility of women's work extended, and the opposition to the Bill was not an opposition to the due extension of that work. He believed that if it were properly considered, the Amendment before the House would assist that work. The Lord President of the Council had himself admitted that if the Bill were passed, very few women would get on to those councils by popular election. What then was the object of the Bill? It was not to satisfy a sentiment, or to serve any political tactics, or any Party object. He assumed that the object of every Member of the House was to utilise, as far as they could for the general benefit, female efficiency and female control, and if the Lord President of the Council was right that they would not obtain any substantial number of women on these councils because they would not go through an election.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: They can also be elected aldermen under the Bill.

LORD JAMES OF HEREFORD said that the noble Earl's statement was that they would not get any large number on the councils by election. He had also said that municipal contests were of the mildest character and did not represent party strife. If the noble Earl would attend some evening about ten o'clock upon the 1st of November in certain localities in Lancashire or Yorkshire, he would find party spirit running in the highest degree and feeling excited to almost as great an extent as in a Parliamentary election. Further, if he would read the newspapers on the 2nd of November he would find the result of the elections claimed as a proof of the extension of party power on one side or the other, and as showing that there was a wave of popular opinion going against a particular Party. What was wanted upon these local authorities were good administrators, and if women were placed upon them they should be persons of good judgment and tact, and persons whose influence would be beneficial. Was it thought that the electors who entered into these political contests and followed the "caucus" would be good selectors of women of the type required? He would have thought that the councils themselves, who knew the duties to be discharged, and the object with which the assistance of women was required, would be far better selectors of the persons whom they should elect. The electors would simply select a woman because she wore a red or a blue colour, and not because she was a good administrator. If the method of election were insisted upon, they could only elect persons who were ratepayers. That would involve shutting out a great number of women whom they would wish to see on the councils. At present in most cases the husband was the ratepayer, and so married women would be practically shut out. Surely that was exactly the opposite of what they who desired to obtain the benefit of women's work on administrative bodies wished to see. The proposition of the Amendment was that the councils themselves should choose their aldermen, and he understood that they would go further than selecting people who were eligible as councillors, and would appoint any whom they thought fit. That would enable to be appointed those married women who at present devoted themselves to educational and social work. These considerations caused him to think that the Amendment was well worthy of consideration. It would meet the objection of those who desired to keep women out of the sphere of political contest and controversy; it would enable county councils who knew the class of women required to select suitable persons. The opposition to the Bill did not arise in the slightest degree from any antipathy to the good work which women might do; in his belief they would do much to further that good work if they accepted the Amendment.

*THE EARL OF JERSEY said that the attitude of supporters of the Amendment was rather curious. They were opposed to the Bill and would like to see it thrown out altogether, and yet they supported the Amendment because they said it would ensure the presence of more women upon the councils. They freely admitted the good service which women could perform upon the various local authorities, but they seemed to forget or to leave out of account the great strength which people had on a representative body when they were freely elected. That was why he was in favour of the Bill as it stood. He believed the object of the measure was to ensure that women should not be debarred from asking their neighbours whether they would support them upon these councils, and it surely could not be a good thing to leave it entirely to the councils to co-opt women as they chose or not. He himself was an alderman and not an elected councillor, and he was sure his position would be much stronger if he were elected. It seemed to him that there was only one course open to the House. They had passed the Second Reading of the Bill and rejected the idea of a Select Committee mainly because the appointment of such a Committee would have meant the postponement of the Bill for this year. Therefore he held that they ought now to pass the Bill through Committee as it stood and not try to minimise its effect.

EARL RUSSELL disagreed with Lord James of Hereford as to there being no demand of sentiment for this Bill. The measure was demanded by the sentiment of ordinary justice for women, and it was that sentiment which led many Members of their Lordships' House to support the Bill on grounds quite apart from the question of whether or not women would do useful work on these bodies. The point of view from which women regarded the question was that they were cut out from a certain portion of public life. They were rated and taxed, but they were not allowed to sit on the bodies which had the spending of the money and the administration of affairs. Women did not wish to sit upon these bodies by the favour of the men already there. They wished to sit as ordinary members with exactly the same mandate and authority as the directly elected representatives of the electors. That was a matter of mere abstract justice, and women were entitled to that concession.

THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND agreed with the noble Earl that there was a great principle lying at the bottom of the Bill. But it was a principle which would lead to conferring the Parliamentary suffrage upon women. There was not one word which the noble Earl had said but would be equally valid in support of the extension of the Parliamentary franchise to women. He understood that His Majesty's Government had repudiated that view. Consequently they had two sections in the House supporting the Bill upon totally different grounds. He was amazed to hear Lord Jersey say that since he had been an alderman he had not had the authority and the confidence which he would have had if he had been elected.

*THE EARL OF JERSEY: I said that I should have been in a stronger position.

THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND was astonished to hear it. He could only say that that was not his experience. He had been a councillor of a county council for several years before he became an alderman; he had since had the honour of being chairman of that council for a number of years, and had uniformly received the utmost support and confidence.

He was certain that his being an alderman had not given him less power or authority than he had as a councillor. A very curious picture of municipal elections had been drawn by the Lord President of the Council. It was true that no barricades were erected or soldiers called out, but he had not known that that was the usual experience in Parliamentary elections. If the noble Earl had ever sat in the Lower House he would have found that a contested election was a very rough-and-tumble affair. The object of the Amendment was to save women from these rough-and-tumble contests, which did no good to them, or their characters, or their influence. He did not believe that the women of the country were increasing their proper influence by the modern fashion of engaging in work which had hitherto been confined to men. He did not mean to say that every lady who took part in public affairs necessarily lost that influence. It was a matter largely dependent upon personal character; but looking at the question as a whole, he believed that women were losing their influence through the modern fashion of engaging in public affairs. It was rather unfair to charge the opponents of this Bill with inconsistency because they supported the Amendment. What they objected to mainly was not the presence of certain ladies upon these councils; they all admitted that there were instances—he believed they were exceptional—where the advice, knowledge, and experience of women were useful. But what they wished to avoid was the friction and the hardening and roughening effect involved in passing through contested elections for seats on the councils. They were asked why, if a lady was sufficiently "unnervous" to stand at an election, she should not be allowed to do so. His answer was that he would like her to be sufficiently nervous not to do it. His opinion was that if women shrank from public struggles and contests they would be the better and not the worse for it. All this legislation had a bad tendency from beginning to end. The Lord President of the Council appeared to have the very curious view that all urban districts aspired to be boroughs. If that were so, they must be the most sanguine of public bodies. A large number of urban districts with which he was acquainted were very difficult so far as area and population went to differentiate from rural districts. They were somewhat more populous, and there were certain reasons which made it desirable that they should have urban rather than rural district council powers. But it was an extraordinary statement to say that they all aspired to be borough councils, and that that was why they had not elected women. The adoption of the Amendment would be an advantage as an experiment. He would have thought that those who were anxious to see women taking part in public affairs would have gladly gone step by step and proved their ground, and for that purpose the Amendment would have been valuable. If they were to embark on this new extension of female operations he supposed they must do it, but he hoped the noble Lord would divide on the Question in order that those who objected to the proposals of the Government might record their protest.

*The Earl of CREWE: I do not desire to make anything in the nature of a general reply, but merely to touch upon two points which were mentioned by Lord James of Hereford. The first was in regard to my observation that I did not think the number of women elected under the Bill would be very large. That was in reply to a statement made on a former occasion that there was a risk in some cases of these bodies being swamped by women. As a matter of fact, while I hope there are some councils where a very fair proportion of women would gain seats, I quite admit that there are others where that is not likely to happen. I do not expect, for instance, that many women, although I should hope that here and there there would be a few, will be elected to the councils of our great cities. Nobody would expect that there would be a large proportion there, but I was anxious to make that statement in view of what the noble Lord said. The second observation is with regard to the proposition that all women, irrespective of qualifications, should be allowed to become aldermen. If you are talking of revolutionary changes, I should have supposed that to place on a public body to spend the ratepayers' money people who are not ratepayers was an infinitely more revolutionary proceeding than anything we proposed to do.

On Question, whether the words "a councillor or" should stand part of the clause,

Their Lordships divided:—Contents, 73; Not-Contents, 46.

CONTENTS.

Canterbury, L. Abp.

Loreburn, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Crewe, E. (*L. President.*)

Ailesbury, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Salisbury, M.

Beauchamp, E.
Camperdown, E.
Carlisle, E.
Carrington, E.
Cawdor, E.
Chesterfield, E.
Craven, E.
Fortescue, E.
Jersey, E.
Lindsey, E.
Onslow, E.
Plymouth, E.
Portsmouth, E.
Russell, E.

Churchill, V.
Esher, V.
Halifax, V.
Hill, V.
Knutsford, V.
Milner, V.
St. Aldwyn, V.

Bangor, L. Bp.
Birmingham, L. Bp.
St. Albans, L. Bp.

Allendale, L.
Armitstead, L.
Balinhard, L. (*E. Southesk.*)
Borthwick, L.
Boston, L.
Bowes, L. (*E. Strathmore and Kinghorn.*)
Brodrick, L. (*V. Midleton.*)
Burghclere, L.
Clifford of Chudleigh, L.
Clinton, L.
Clonbrock, L.
Colebrooke, L.
Courtney of Penwith, L.
Dawnay, L. (*V. Downe.*)
Denman, L. [*Teller.*]
Digby, L.
Dunning, L (*L. Rollo.*)
Elgin, L (*E. Elgin and Kincardine.*)
Eversley, L.
Fitzmaurice, L.
Glantawe, L.
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*) [*Teller*]
Grey de Ruthyn, L.
Hamilton of Dalzell, L.
Haversham, L.
Hindlip, L.
Joicey, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll.*)
Lawrence, L.
Lyveden, L.
Macnaghten, L.
Muskerry, L.
Newlands, L.
O'Hagan, L.
Oriel, L. (*V. Massereene.*)
Redesdale, L.
Ribblesdale, L.
Ritchie of Dundee, L.
Sanderson, L.
Sandhurst, L.
Shute, L. (*V. Barrington.*)
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran.*)
Weardale, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Norfolk, D. (*E. Marshal.*)

Northumberland, D.
Somerset, D.

Camden, M.
Zetland, M.

Abingdon, E.
Cathcart, E.
Clarendon, E.
Coventry, E.
Fitzwilliam, E.
Halsbury, E.
Harrowby, E.
Malmesbury, E. [*Teller.*]
Manvers, E.
Mount Edgcumbe, E.
Northbrook, E.
Romney, E.
Waldegrave, E.
Westmeath, E.

Cross, V.
Falkland, V.
Goschen, V.
Hardinge, V.

Abinger, L.
Atkinson, L.
Avebury, L.
Balfour, L.
Barnard, L.
Barrymore, L.
Calthorpe, L.
Hay, L. (*E. Kinnoul.*)
James, L.
Kenry, L. (*E. Dunraven and Mount-Earl.*)
Kensington, L.
Killanin, L.
Leigh, L.
Monk Bretton, L. [*Teller.*]
Newton, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough*)
Ravensworth, L.
Rothschild, L.
St. Levan, L.
Saltoun, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Templemore, L.
Zouche of Haryngworth, L.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN moved an Amendment to provide that a woman shall not be elected chairman of a county council or mayor of a borough. It seemed to him that though a woman might perfectly well be a councillor or alderman, it was not desirable that she should be put in a position where questions of order arose, and where it would be necessary for her to exercise authority. One or two ladies who had written him in regard to the Bill had declared that they would be content with a limitation of the kind proposed, and that they would not consider it as in any way derogating from the position they would obtain as members of the council.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 8, to leave out the word 'if,' and to insert the words 'shall not be.'"—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

*THE EARL OF CREWE: This is not a very large matter—not nearly so large as that on which the House has just expressed its opinion. The noble Lord proposes that so far as the chairmanship of a county council or borough council is concerned, a woman should not be eligible. We have simply gone on the analogy of the district councils. By Section 22 of the Act of 1894 it is provided that the chairman of a district council should be a justice of the peace, unless a woman or personally disqualified, and that is the same limitation and restriction that we have adopted in this Bill. My own view of the matter is that it is a pity to place any grudging limitations of this kind in such an Act. I do not think the cases in which a council, either county or borough, would elect a woman as chairman would be otherwise than rare; they would be so few, in my opinion, that the effect of the limitation would not be great. It is really a matter for the House to decide; I have no very strong feeling either way, except on the ground that as we are doing this it seems a pity to place any limitations upon it. But I am quite content to abide by the decision of the House in the matter.

VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN hoped the Government would accept the Amendment. The noble Earl had admitted that it was not probable at all that a woman would be elected chairman of a county council; and it was even less probable that she would be elected mayor of a borough, and there was no doubt whatever that there were some public functions which a woman could not perform. That was admitted by the Bill itself: she could not be a justice of the peace, and it was proposed to exclude her from that office. There was no real reason, as far as he could see from the arguments which had been advanced, why it should be possible for her to be elected mayor of a borough. She could not be knighted, as all proper mayors desired to be; therefore, by the very nature of things, she was excluded from that which was the object of everybody in attempting to arrive at the position of mayor. He hoped the Amendment would be accepted.

EARL RUSSELL said there were two material and substantial reasons why the Amendment should not be accepted. By the division just taken the House had decided that in the matter of being elected councillors or aldermen women should be on an equality with men. It was now proposed that quite unnecessarily they should go out of their way to stamp such women councillors with a special little mark of inferiority. It was admitted that the contingency was very remote, but the stigma was quite unnecessary. The second consideration, which ought to weigh very much with the House, was from the point of view of the local authorities themselves. The effect of the Amendment was really this: A council of thirty persons might be unanimously of opinion—it was unlikely, but it might happen—that a particular woman was most fitted to be chairman of the council, but Parliament interposed and said they should not have the right to manage their own affairs and elect their own chairman. He could not see why the local authorities should not be trusted to do what they thought best, and he hoped the Amendment would not be accepted.

LORD COURTNEY OF PENWITH said that while he did not regard the Amendment as one of practical importance, agreeing with the Lord President that it would come into operation only in the rarest possible instances, he thought there was some weight to be attached to the argument that it in effect declared that if a particular member of a county or borough council had shown herself so capable of managing business that the council desired to place her in the chair they should be incapable of doing so. He might give, as an illustration, an analogous case. As their Lordships were aware, many women were members of school boards. In one distinguished school board—a body not inferior to any in Great Britain—a lady who had served as a member of the Board since its inception, a period of more than twenty years, so proved her capacity as a woman of business and sense, and so acquired the respect of her colleagues, that, on a vacancy occurring in the chairmanship, she was elected to the position, which she retained down to her death. In such a case as that of Miss Flora Stevenson, were the School Board of Edinburgh to be disqualified from electing to be their chairman a woman who had proved her capacity for the position by her services on the board? Surely it was not worth while to make these little niggling Amendments! The larger and better policy was to allow freedom of action to the councils themselves.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN said the Amendment was not of much practical importance either way. Personally he was rather in favour of it, and he would be guided in the course he took very much by the relative volumes of sound when the Chairman put the Question.

***THE EARL OF CREWE**: I am very much in the same position. After what I have said I do not think I should record my vote either way, but, under the belief that the noble Viscount opposite represents the majority of the House, I am disposed to ask my noble friends not to divide. Of course, if they are of a different opinion, it is within their competence to take a division. As regards the noble Viscount's statement that ladies were incapable of being knighted, I am not sure that he is historically correct. At any rate, there was one case in history—I am not sure whether it was in the reign of King Charles—in which a lady was made a Baronet.

On Question, whether the word "if" should stand part of the clause,

Their Lordships divided:—Contents, 49; Not-Contents, 61.

CONTENTS.

Canterbury, L. Abp.

Loreburn, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Beauchamp, E.
Carlisle, E.
Carrington, E.
Chesterfield, E.
Craven, E.
Fortescue, E.
Russell, E. [*Teller.*]

Churchill, V.
Esher, V.
Knutsford, V.
Milner, V.

Bangor, L. Bp.

Birmingham, L. Bp.

Allendale, L.
Armitstead, L.
Avebury, L.
Boston, L.
Burghclere, L.
Clifford of Chudleigh, L.
Colebrooke, L.
Courtney of Penwith, L.
Denman, L.
Digby, L.
Dunboyne, L.
Dunning, L. (*L. Rollo.*)
Elgin, L. (*E. Elgin and Kincardine.*)
Eversley, L.
Fitzmaurice, L.
Glantawe, L.

Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*)
Grey de Ruthyn, L.
Hamilton of Dalzell, L.
Haversham, L.
Joicey, L.
Killanin, L.
Lawrence, L.
Lucas, L.
Lyveden, L. [*Teller.*]
Macnaghten, L.
Montagu of Beaulieu, L.
Nunburnholme, L.
Ribblesdale, L.
Sanderson, L.
Sandhurst, L.
Shute, L. (*V. Barrington.*)
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran.*)
Weardale, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Norfolk, D. (*E. Marshal.*)

Northumberland, D.
Somerset, D.

Ailesbury, M.
Camden, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Salisbury, M.
Zetland, M.

Abingdon, E.
Camperdown, E. [*Teller.*]
Cathcart, E.
Cawdor, E.
Eldon, E.
Harrowby, E.
Jersey, E.
Lindsey, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Manvers, E.
Mount Edgcumbe, E.
Onslow, E.

Romney, E.
Waldegrave, E.
Westmeath, E.

Cross, V.
Falkland, V.
Goschen, V.
Halifax, V.
Hardinge, V.
Hill, V.
St. Aldwyn, V.

Abinger, L.
Balfour, L.
Balinhard, L. (*E. Southesk.*)
Barnard, L.
Barrymore, L.
Belper, L.
Bowes, L. (*E. Strathmore and Kinghorn.*)
Brodrick, L. (*V. Midleton.*)
Calthorpe, L.
Clinton, L.

Clonbrock, L.
Dawnay, L. (*V. Downe.*)
Forester, L.
Hay, L. (*E. Kinnoull.*)
Hindlip, L.
James, L.
Kenry, L. (*E. Dunraven and Mount-Earl.*)
Kensington, L.
Leigh, L.
Monk-Bretton, L. [*Teller.*]
Muskerry, L.
Newlands, L.
Newton, L.
Oriel, L. (*V. Massereene.*)
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Ravensworth, L.
Ritchie of Dundee, L.
Saltoun, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Templemore, L.
Zouche of Haryngworth, L.

On Question, the proposed words "shall not be elected" were there inserted.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN moved to omit the words declaring that a woman shall not by virtue of holding or having held the office of chairman of a county council or mayor of a borough be a justice of the peace. He pointed out that this Amendment was consequential on the decision just taken.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 8, to leave out from the word 'borough' to the end of the subsection."—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Bill reported to the House.

Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Tuesday next; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 109.)

ADVERTISEMENTS REGULATION BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order).

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2:—

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH moved an Amendment limiting the power of local authorities to make by-laws for the regulation and control of hoardings and similar structures used for the purpose of advertising to cases where such hoardings or structures "exceed twelve feet in height." He pointed out that the effect of the Amendment would be to restore the Bill to the form in which it passed their Lordships' House two years ago and in which it was introduced in the House of Commons in the present session. The limitation had been a matter of general agreement and acceptance, but in the Committee of the other House the words were omitted against the desire both of the promoters of the Bill and of the representative of the Home Office. He hoped the House would restore the Bill to its original form, in which it would do all that was necessary, and be less in restraint of trade.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 9, after the word 'advertising' to insert the words 'when they exceed twelve feet in height.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

LORD BELPER asked what was the particular virtue of twelve feet. As far as he understood, the proposal related to those hideous advertisements which were put alongside railways and in places where they spoilt the amenities of the neighbourhood. If the effect was simply to compel those who erected the advertisements to make them 11 feet 6 inches instead of 12 feet, he did not think it would improve the situation to any great extent.

EARL BEAUCHAMP said the whole Bill had been a matter of considerable discussion between the bill-posting industry and the promoters of the measure. Twelve feet was a very well-known height in the trade, many advertisements being printed for hoardings of that size. As the particular height was a compromise between two parties, in consequence of which the bill-posters withdrew their opposition to the Bill, he thought the noble Lord was well advised in seeking to restore the words.

LORD BELPER said it was no answer to his question to say that two people had agreed to a proposal. Nothing would be easier than to cut off a few inches from the bottom of these advertisements, and if the object of the Bill was to secure control over advertisements, it seemed to him that that object would be largely frustrated by limiting the height in the manner proposed.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH said that, so far as abstract principle was concerned, there was nothing in the regulation as to 12 feet, except that many urban district councils and other authorities already had control over advertisements above 12 feet in height, and it was not unreasonable that, as the principle was to some extent established, general control should start at that height. He did not like to plead agreements made outside Parliament, as the

House might naturally say that people had no right to make agreements interfering with the freedom of either House of Parliament. The promoters, however, were under an honourable obligation not to proceed with the Bill if the omission of these words was insisted upon. The Bill passed by their Lordships two years ago contained these words; it was introduced in the House of Commons in that form, and those interested in the trade abstained from opposition on the understanding that the words would be adhered to. While he could not fetter the absolute freedom of the House to do as it chose in the matter, if the omission of the words was insisted upon the promoters of the Bill would be placed in an extremely difficult and delicate position, and would feel honourably bound not to proceed further with the measure.

LORD BELPER did not think the answer which had been given was a very satisfactory one for those who had hoped there would be power in the Bill to deal with the unsightly advertisements to which he had referred. He did not wish to wreck the Bill, particularly at that stage, but he would take the opportunity of considering whether at a later stage words could not be introduced to make the provision more effective.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH moved to amend the provisions exempting hoardings and similar structures in use for advertising purposes for a period not exceeding two years, by substituting "five" for "two." The period of five years was originally in the Bill, and the case for its retention was very strong, inasmuch as some of the individuals interested in advertisement display had made contracts for a period of years, most of which would expire before five, but not before two years had elapsed. Under these circumstances, it being a matter of considerable importance to the trade, he thought it expedient that the words should be restored, and he moved accordingly.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 9, to leave out the word 'two,' and insert the word 'five.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH moved to insert the following new subsection: "The expression 'pleasure promenade' shall not include any road or street mainly used for business purposes." He said that the Amendment had been suggested by the London Chamber of Commerce. Some of those interested in the trade feared that the words "pleasure promenade" as they stood in the Bill were too vague and might lead to litigation. A member of the deputation of the Chamber of Commerce declared that the advertisements in certain thoroughfares in London were to him a source of positive delight, and that he went along those streets for the purpose of looking at them. It was a somewhat curious taste, and the fear was expressed that such a street might be termed a "pleasure promenade." He thought the argument rather far-fetched, but the words could not do any harm, and in order to show that it was really intended to confine the strict regulation of advertisments to places which were for pleasure and not for business he suggested that the Amendment should be accepted.

Amendment moved—

"To insert as a new sub-section: 'The expression 'pleasure promenade' shall not include any road or street mainly used for business purposes.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN pointed out that no allusion had been made in the course of the debate to the right of the private owner of a house or shop or land with which a local authority under the Bill might interfere. He did not want to defend the hideous advertisements which were to be seen in some parts of the country; he would be very glad if the Bill put an end to them; but there must be cases where purely business advertisements had been put up almost from time immemorial on private houses or at the corner of a street which would not be covered by the proposed Amendment.

EARL BEAUCHAMP said that in the view of the Home Office the Amendment was somewhat superfluous. Roads and streets used mainly for business purposes would not in any case naturally become pleasure promenades, but there might possibly be difficult cases. For instance, it was always a pleasure to walk along Piccadilly, which was also a place of business. Perhaps the noble Lord would think it better to reconsider the matter and propose words more carefully thought out in Standing Committee.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH said he was in the hands of the Home Office, who had given him considerable help both two years ago and in the Standing Committee of the other House. Personally he did not think the Amendment necessary, but it was put down in good faith to allay the apprehensions of those who thought the Bill would unduly interfere not only with what they thought was legitimate business, but with things ornamental in themselves. With regard to that point raised by Lord St. Aldwyn, he could not conceive that advertisements which were purely temporary in their nature would ever be subject to regulation by the local authority. They must assume good sense on the part of the local authority, regulated by the superior power of the Government Department. He was anxious to get the Bill through with as little friction as possible, and if the noble Viscount would, at a subsequent stage, suggest words to carry out his view he would endeavour to accept them.

VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN said he would rather the words now proposed were not inserted.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH said that under the circumstances he would ask leave to withdraw the Amendment, and if the noble Viscount could at a later stage suggest words which would not be objectionable he would be glad to consider them.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY, in the interest of those who would have to decide the question, asked what was supposed to be meant by a "pleasure promenade." Could the noble Earl give an instance in London of what he considered a pleasure promenade where advertisements might be displayed?

EARL BEAUCHAMP pointed out that the clause was not confined to London, but dealt with other places also.

Earl Beachamp.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY said he had only mentioned London for the purposes of illustration.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

LORD AVEBURY said he had been requested by the Borough Council of Islington to ask why the powers given to Scotland under Clause 5 should not be given to England under the clause now before the House.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH replied that as first drafted the clause referred to had application to England also, but the Home Office pointed out that the law as it stood was strong enough to meet the case, whereas in Scotland it was not so. In England the owner of private property had sufficient power to stop the advertisements in question, but that was not the case in Scotland; hence the difference in the clauses.

LORD BELPER said the question seemed to bear on the point he had raised earlier in the debate. The local authority would have power under the clause to make by-laws for two purposes—first, for the regulation and control of hoardings and similar structures used for the purpose of advertising when they exceeded twelve feet in height, and, secondly, for regulating, restricting, or preventing the exhibition of advertisements in such places and in such manner, or by such means, as to affect injuriously the amenities of a public park or pleasure promenade, or to disfigure the natural beauty of a landscape. Those two provisions naturally ran side by side, but did the limitation of twelve feet apply to the second? His objection would be very largely met if it did not. The advertisements to which he referred were those which disfigured the natural beauty of a landscape or injuriously affected the amenities of a public park and so on. If in those cases the local authority could absolutely do away with advertisements whether they were over twelve feet or no the would be to a large extent satisfied.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH said he thought the point was so obvious that he had not mentioned it. The restriction applied only to the first part of the clause. There was no restriction as to height in the second subsection, except that the by-laws had to be confirmed by the central authority.

LORD BELPER did not think the point was so obvious as had been suggested. The first part of the clause referred to hoardings generally, and they might be supposed to include hoardings in the places referred to in the second part.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3 agreed to.

LORD KILLANIN moved the insertion, after Clause 3, of a new clause providing that it should be the duty of every metropolitan borough council within its own area to enforce the by-laws made under the Act, and to defray the expenses incurred in connection therewith. He had been asked by the London County Council to propose the Amendment, which carried out a resolution passed unanimously by that body. The object was to meet a difficulty which it was anticipated would arise. It appeared that in other Acts of Parliament, especially under Section 84 of the London Building Act, 1894, powers as to hoardings were given to and exclusively administered by the metropolitan borough councils. It was thought advisable, therefore, that the administration of by-laws made under this Bill dealing with hoardings should also be in the hands of the borough councils, otherwise there would be a certain amount of dual control which might be very confusing and lead to the inefficiency of the Act.

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 3, to insert the following new clause, 'In the application of this Act to the administrative county of London, outside the City of London, it shall be the duty of every metropolitan borough council within its own area to enforce the by-laws made under this Act, and any expenses incurred by a metropolitan borough council shall be defrayed as part of the expenses of that council.' "—(*Lord Killanin.*)

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH said he would like the advice of the Home Office in this matter. Two years ago the Home Office and the Local Government Board had a conference with the promoters of the Bill, and as a result of that conference the Bill, so far as it concerned the action of the local authorities, was drafted in its present form. Since the resolution to which reference had been made was passed by the County Council he had received a representation from the borough of Southwark that if it were given effect to they would want something else. He hoped the Bill would not be imperilled so far as it affected the rest of the country by any contest between the different authorities in London. Doubtless they each had their own rights and privileges to conserve, and he would be guided by the advice of the Home Office, who had expert knowledge as to how far the different authorities were in the right.

EARL BEAUCHAMP said he must ask the House not to accept the Amendment, largely on account of the dual control it would set up. The Bill provided that the authority to make the by-laws should be the county council, and the noble Lord proposed that those by-laws should be enforced by the metropolitan borough councils. The view of the Home Office was that on the whole it would be better that the body which made the by-laws should also enforce them. That was the usual custom in regard to by-laws of this description, and it would be advisable to adhere to it in this case. The powers with regard to hoardings given to the borough councils under Section 84 of the London Building Act, 1894, had no reference whatever to advertisements, but concerned the safety of the erections and the length of time they were to remain; hence there would be no dual control in the matter of advertisements. The Bill affected considerably more than mere hoardings. It referred, for instance, to the advertisements mentioned by Lord Belper, and it was not thought advisable that the metropolitan borough councils should have the control of those advertisements, for the reason that their area of jurisdiction was not very large, and it might very easily happen that the advertisements would disfigure a promenade or public walk in the area of another borough council than that in which the advertisement itself appeared. On the whole it was better that the matter should not be considered as one of purely local concern, but that it should be in the hands of a larger authority than the borough council. No request had reached the Home Office from any metropolitan borough councils asking that this power should be given them, and under the circumstances he hoped the proposed new clause would not be accepted.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 4 agreed to.

Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH moved the insertion, after Clause 4, of a new clause with the objection of making it perfectly clear that this general law would not repeal provisions in local Acts of special importance to the localities concerned. Edinburgh, for instance, had power to prevent advertising on the Castle Rock; and Dover had a right to restrain a syndicate from the other side of the Atlantic from advertising a certain preparation on the cliffs above Dover. Other places had local provisions of special importance to themselves, and while it was not certain that the clause was necessary, it could do no harm, and it would ensure that those places which had been foremost in securing their own protection would not be placed in a worse position than at present.

Amendment moved—

"To insert the following new clause: 'The powers and provisions of this Act shall be deemed to be in addition to and not in derogation of any other powers or provisions of any local Act of Parliament, and the powers and provisions of any such local Act may be exercised and enforced in the same manner as if this Act had not been passed.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 5 agreed to.

Clause 6:—

Lord KILLANIN moved to amend the definition by making the London County Council the local authority within the "administrative" county of London. He pointed out that the administrative county of London included portions of three counties.

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 15, after the first 'the' to insert the word 'administrative.'"—(*Lord Killanin.*)

Earl BEAUCHAMP said the Home Office were not responsible for the exact wording throughout the Bill, but in Standing Committee they proposed to move the omission of the words "and within the county of London outside the city of London the London County Council," as being unnecessary.

Earl Beauchamp.

Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH suggested that as the Home Office were going to move certain drafting Amendments the noble Lord would do well to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Lord DENMAN moved to omit the words "or Ireland" from the subsection defining the expression "local authority" within any municipal borough in England or Ireland to mean the council of that borough. He explained that words already in Subsection (4) included municipal boroughs in Ireland, and therefore, in order not to overload the clause, it was proposed to omit the words "or Ireland" from Subsection (2).

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 17, to leave out the words 'or Ireland.'"—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 6, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 7:—

Lord DENMAN said the Amendment he now proposed was merely a matter of drafting, the substitution of the Public Health (Ireland) Acts for the Public Health Acts being necessary.

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 31, after the word 'State' to insert the words the 'Public Health (Ireland) Acts 1878 to 1900,' shall be substituted for the Public Health Acts, and any references to a borough shall not have effect.'"—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill re-committed to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended. [No. 110.]

SALMON AND FRESHWATER FISHERIES BILL. [H.L.]

Read 3ª (according to order); Drafting Amendments made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Seven o'clock, to Monday next, half-past Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 11*th July*, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Kendal Corporation Bill [Lords]; Wisbech Water Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Devonport Corporation Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; A Clause added; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Tees Valley Water (Consolidation) Bill [Lords].—As amended considered; to be read the third time.

Tees Conservancy Bill [Lords] (by Order).—Order for consideration, as amended, read, and discharged—Bill re-committed to the former Committee in respect of the provisions relating to the superannuation fund.

Ordered, That the Committee have leave to sit and proceed forthwith.—(*The Deputy Chairman.*)

Dundee Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Portobello and Musselburgh Tramways (Levenhall Extension) Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read a second time; to be considered upon Monday next.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP J.)

Major SEELY reported from the Committee on Group J of Private Bills; That the parties opposing the Renfrewshire Upper District (Eastwood and Mearns) Water Bill had stated that the evidence of William H. Hill, of 194, Ingram Street, Glasgow, was essential to their case; and, it having been proved that his attendance could not be procured without the intervention of the House, he had been instructed to move that the said William H. Hill do attend the said Committee To-morrow and on Monday 15th July, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Ordered, That William H. Hill do attend the Committee on Group J of Private Bills To-morrow and on Monday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords]—Reported without Amendment. [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill [Lords]; Oxford and District Tramways Bill [Lords]; Tees Conservancy (re-committed) Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP J).

Major SEELY reported from the Committee on group J of Private Bills; That Mr. Strauss, one of the members of the said Committee, was not present during the sitting of the Committee this day.

Report to lie upon the Table.

BROADSTAIRS AND ST. PETER'S URBAN DISTRICT WATER BILL [LORDS].

Report [9th July] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill to be read a second time.—(*The Deputy Chairman.*)

PETITIONS.

MOTOR TRAFFIC (PROTECTION OF CHILDREN, CATTLE, AND CROPS.)

Petition from Preston Patrick, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

SMALL LANDHOLDERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Fife, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

WEEKLY REST-DAY BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Harlesden and other places; and, Peckham and other places; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CRIMINAL AND JUDICIAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Criminal and Judicial Statistics of Ireland for the year 1906. Part II. Civil Statistics [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (TEXTILE FACTORIES).

Copy presented, of Report of the Textile Factories Labour Committee appointed by the Government of India, December, 1906, to inquire into the Conditions of Factory Labour in India, with Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS.

Copy presented, of Tables which have been prepared in connection with the Question of Old-age Pensions [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy Presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No. 3856 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC INCOME AND EXPENDITURE.

Return ordered, "of net Public Income and net Public Expenditure under certain specified heads, as represented by receipts into and issues out of the Exchequer from 1892–3 to 1906–7, inclusive (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 266, of session 1906)."—(*Sir Henry Fowler.*)

APPOINTMENT OF JUSTICES (FEES).

Address for "Return of Fees payable on appointment by Justices of the Peace in England and Wales."—(*Mr. Herbert Samuel.*)

HIGHER EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES.)

Return ordered, "showing the expenditure to which, and the manner in which, local authorities in England and in Wales have applied funds for the purposes of Education other than elementary during the year 1906–7 under any of the following Acts: Education Act, 1902; Welsh Intermediate Education Act, 1889; Public Libraries and Museums Acts; Local or Private Acts."—(*Mr. McKenna*).

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Facilities for Youthful Offenders Bill.

MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, upon further consideration, he can see his way to give facilities to the Youthful Offenders Bill.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) No, Sir. I am afraid the Government cannot do this. As I said, in reply to my hon. friend's previous Question on the 24th April, the effect of the Probation of Offenders Bill, which is now before the House, will in many cases be to substitute for fine and imprisonment a new method of dealing with offenders, which will be especially applicable to juvenile cases. My hon. friend the Under-Secretary hopes, moreover, to introduce next session, on behalf of the Government, a comprehensive Bill dealing with many points relating to the protection of children and the offences committed by them, and in connection with that Bill the question raised in the Youthful Offenders Bill will be carefully considered.

Young Persons and Intoxicants.

MR. WEDGWOOD: To ask the President of the Board of Education whether his attention has been drawn to a volume by Sir Victor Horsley and Dr Mary Sturge, entitled: *Alcohol and the Human Body*, in which it is stated that evidence is steadily accumulating that the stunted frames and weak development of many poor children is at any rate partly due both directly and indirectly to the action of alcohol; that one of the most frequent causes of evil habits and of sexual immorality among young people is the taking of alcohol; that for the sake of national morality as well as physique it is clear that in no form whatever should alcohol be used by the young, either in childhood or adolescence; if he will say what teaching, if any, is given on the subject in the public elementary schools; and whether he will prescribe and enforce lessons thereupon in all schools over which he has any authority.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The Answer to the first paragraph of the Question is in the negative, but I would draw my hon. friend's attention to paragraph 7 in the prefatory memorandum to the new Code of Regulations for Public Elementary Schools, and to paragraph 4 in the prefatory memorandum to the new Regulations for Training Colleges, just issued, which will show, I think, that the Board of Education are doing their best to secure adequate and efficient teaching in the important matters referred to in my hon. friend's Question.

Accommodation for the Board of Agriculture.

MR. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R.. Barkston Ash): To ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he can now state whether any, and, if so, what, steps are contemplated by the Government to provide better accommodation for the Board of Agriculture.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) I regret that I am unable to add anything at present to my Answer to the hon. Member on the 23rd of April last.† The matter is still under consideration.

Sale of Estate of Captain Magan in County Kildare.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (Kildare, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether negotiations are in progress for the sale, under the Land Act of 1903, of the estate of Captain Magan in the county of Kildare; whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement by an evicted tenant named Peter Grady, who was evicted from a farm on the estate in the year 1896; and whether, in any settlement of the estate, the application of this evicted tenant will be attended to by the Commissioners.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners are in communication with the owner of the estate referred to, with a view to the purchase of untenanted land. If they shall acquire such land, they will consider the application for reinstatement which has been lodged by Peter Grady.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

H.M.S. "Cumberland."

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty on what date was H.M.S. "Cumberland" docked prior to her recent docking at Devonport.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, (Dundee): The "Cumberland" was last docked at Gibraltar on the 20th December, 1905. I am inquiring into the reasons for the abnormally long interval between this and her recent docking at Devonport.

MR. HUNT: Is it not the ordinary rule that ships shall be docked every six months?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I do not think it is quite so short a period as that.

H.M.S. "Edward VII."

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the defective casting of the rudder of H.M.S. "Edward VII." was inspected by an Admiralty inspector before being built into the ship; and, if so, whether such inspector had practical knowledge of castings.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I am informed that the Answer to both Questions is in the affirmative.

Naval Shipbuilding Programme.

MR. HUNT: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, with regard to the provisions in the Navy Estimates for twelve torpedo boats and twelve submarines, whether this programme is to be adhered to, or if any modification of the programme has been made will he state the nature of it.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Any modification of the shipbuilding programme will, according to custom, be communicated to the House when Vote 8 is reached, but the hon. Member must not infer that there will be any modification.

H.M.S. "Indefatigable."

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether H.M.S. "Indefatigable" is to proceed this year to Bermuda to dock for repairs; how long it is estimated that the repairs will take;

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxii., 1570.

and whether a ship will be sent to replace the "Indefatigable" in West Indian waters during her absence in Bermuda.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The "Indefatigable" is en route to Bermuda for docking and to carry out prize firing. No estimate of the time she will be in dock can be given until she has been examined at Bermuda. The presence of the "Scylla" in West Indian waters is considered by the Admiralty sufficient for present needs.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON: In the event of the repairs taking more time than is anticipated will the right hon. Gentleman assure the House that another vessel shall be sent to take her place?

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I can give no further assurance than that the matter shall be considered.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Why not take your advice from the Lords of the Admiralty rather than from amateur sailors?

Sir GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): Has any decision been come to with regard to increasing the naval force on the West Indian station?

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON asked for notice.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what is the number of marines borne in H.M.S. "Indefatigable" and H.M.S. "Scylla" respectively."

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The numbers allowed by complement are as follows:—

	Officers.	N.C.O.'s and Men.
"Indefatigable" -	4	130
"Scylla" - - - -	–	26

The latter ship has the full ordinary complement of her class.

Ships' Armaments.

Mr. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that in the Return of Fleets no less than twenty-one armoured ships are shown by comparison with previous Return to have reduced their armaments by two 12-pounder guns each; and whether in view of the importance of these guns for destroying torpedo craft, he can state for what purpose the reductions have been made.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The Admiralty do not accept the hon. Member's view as to the importance of these guns for destroying torpedo craft.

Mr. COURTHOPE: Is that Answer consistent with the fact that they have recently been supplied with even more of these guns than before?

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON asked for notice.

H.M.S. "Renown."

Mr. GRETTON (Rutland): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, in view of the battleship "Renown" being credited in the Return of Fleets with 4 10-inch, 10 6-inch, and 12 12-pounder guns, whether these guns are all on board this ship at the present date; and whether the ship is part of the Home Fleet with a nucleus crew on board.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The whole of the "Renown's" armament is not on board. She is a special service vessel attached to the Home Fleet, and together with the other vessels in this class, she is ready for service at five days notice, in which time the whole of her armament would be complete.

Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): Would it be against the interests of the Service to say if this ship has had her armament reduced?

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The armament has not been reduced. The guns were taken away because the ship was not being used for warlike purposes and they simply have not been replaced as yet.

H.M.S. "Blake" and H.M.S. "Blenheim."

Mr. GRETTON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that H.M.S. "Blake" and H.M.S. "Blenheim" are each having their armaments reduced from two 9·2-inch and ten 6-inch guns to four 6–inch guns on each ship, in order to fit them as mother ships for torpedo craft; and whether he can state why, under these circumstances, these ships appear in the new Return of Fleets for this year as first-class cruisers credited with their full original armaments.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: No change has yet been made in the "Blake's" armament which is now as described in the Return quoted. The "Blenheim" is now in dockyard hands, and the preparation of the ship for her new duties is not yet complete.

MR. GRETTON: Is any change contemplated in the armament of the "Blake"?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: No, I think not.

The Militia and the Special Reserve.

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is proposed to offer any, and, if so, what, inducement to join the nucleus third battalions or Special Contingent to recruits or men serving in the present Militia respectively.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. BUCHANAN, Perthshire, E.): A recruit joining the Special Reserve will do so under the conditions obtaining for that force. A serving Militiaman will be offered a bonus of £2, in view of the liability to foreign service.

MR. COURTHOPE was understood to ask if Volunteers now serving would also get the £2.

MR. BUCHANAN: I should like to have notice of that Question.

Militia Officers and the War Office Committee.

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether all parts of the country were represented on the body of Militia officers who discussed certain Militia questions with the War Office Committee, whose Report has recently been issued.

MR. BUCHANAN: The Militia commanding officers, whose names are given in the Command Paper [Cd. 3,513], were carefully selected by the War Office, in consultation with the several general officers commanding-in-chief. An examination of the units which they command will show that all parts of the country were represented, two of these units being located in the Eastern Command, two in the Southern, two in the Western, and three in the Northern. Scotland furnished two representatives, and Ireland three.

Plague in India.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he has yet received answers from the Government of India to his questions in April in reference to the special medical staff deputed to combat the plague.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. MORLEY, Montrose Burghs): I have heard from the Government of India that local governments are engaged in collecting the needful information, but as the statistics wanted extend over a series of years they cannot be procured without some delay. The subject of the plague is engaging my particular attention, and full Papers will shortly be laid on the Table.

Indian Railways.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether any steps are being taken here, apart from any action that may be contemplated by the Government of India, for relieving the tension of the crisis in connection with the deficiency of wagons and rolling stock, which is causing prejudice and inconvenience to the commercial community and loss to the railways.

I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will now state what the available funds are likely to be for the purpose of an increased expenditure upon Indian railways over and above the sum provided for in the East India Financial Statement.

MR. MORLEY: Perhaps I may be allowed to answer my hon. friends two Questions together. As stated in my reply to another Question asked by him on the 9th instant, I have sanctioned an addition of £1,000,000 to the programme of capital expenditure for the present year. The greater part of this grant is being devoted to the supply of additional rolling-stock. By the addition of this £1,000,000 the funds available for capital expenditure on Indian railways will be increased from £9,000,000, as provided in the Financial Statement, to £10,000,000.

Johannesburg Tramways.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to the new tramway regulations of the Johannesburg Town Council; whether the reservations in the Transvaal Letters Patent in respect of any law whereby persons not of European birth or descent may be subjected or made liable to any disabilities or restrictions to which persons of European birth or descent are not also subjected or made liable apply to municipal by-laws since enacted within the Transvaal Colony under which British-Indians are subjected to disabilities and restrictions of a differential and humiliating character; and, if the reservations do not apply, whether His Majesty's Government is without any means of extending its protection to our British-Indian fellow-subjects against such differential treatment by Transvaal municipalities and similar corporations.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): Yes, Sir. I have seen the regulations. Section 39 of the Letters Patent does not apply to municipal regulations. This is not a subject upon which representations could be made by the Secretary of State to the responsible Government with any advantage.

Western Australia—Treatment of Natives.

MR. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Government of Western Australia has passed any legislation or taken any administrative action, such as was promised in 1905, with a view to putting an end to the abuses in connection with the treatment of Natives disclosed in Dr. Roth's Report.

MR. CHURCHILL: I have to refer the hon. Member to the reply which I gave on 8th July to a similar Question asked by the hon. Member for East Clare.†

Labour Inspection in the New Hebrides.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL (Staffordshire, Kingswinford): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies how many female inspectors are to be appointed for the women and children indentured under the New Hebrides Convention.

MR. CHURCHILL: As no arrangements have ever previously been made for the inspection of labourers employed by British subjects in the New Hebrides, there is no experience available for guidance in determining the character of the system of inspection required and the number of inspectors; but His Majesty's Government have asked the High Commissioner for the Western Pacific to report on the subject, and have informed him that they regard it as of great importance that the system of inspection should be thoroughly adequate.

Deaths from Plague in Egypt.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can say what was the number of deaths from plague in Egypt during January, February, March, April, May, and June, respectively, this year.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): The figures are: 8, 46, 204, 147, 184, and 111 to 17th June, respectively.

Outrages in Macedonia.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any of the Turkish perpetrators of outrages in Macedonia (recorded in the recent Blue-book) have been punished; and, if so, what was the nature of the punishment.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) asked if the right hon. Gentleman would give the same formation as to outrages committed by persons who were not Turks.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have received no information on the subject since the appearance of the Blue-book. His Majesty's Ambassador has, when outrages occur, pressed for energetic action in securing and punishing the guilty persons and will continue to do so.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxvii., 1156–7.

Newfoundland Fisheries.

MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is in a position to give any information to the House as to the progress of the negotiations with the United States on the Newfoundland question.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): May I also ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can say what progress has been made in the negotiations with the Newfoundland Government as to the *modus vivendi* with the United States on the fisheries question?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I am not able to add to the information which I gave to the hon. Member for Mid Armagh on the 27th of June. No agreement has yet been arrived at, and negotiations on the subject are proceeding.

MR. ASHLEY: When will Papers be laid?

SIR EDWARD GREY: We cannot lay Papers until the negotiations have been concluded. We are doing our best to arrive at an agreement.

Great Britain, Russia, and Persia.

MR. LYNCH (Yorkshire W.R., Ripon): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in connection with the negotiations now proceeding with the Russian Government with a view to harmonising the interests of the two Powers in Persia, he will appoint a small Committee of experts thoroughly acquainted with Persia and the contiguous regions to confer together and to advise him in the preparation of the British case.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I assume that the hon. Member means a Committee of non-official experts not connected with the British or Indian Governments. I do not consider that such a course, which is capable of indefinite extension, is desirable, though the hon. Member can always on his own initiative put forward either information or opinions for consideration.

MR. LYNCH: In view of the great importance of this subject will the right hon. Gentleman reassure the House and the country by stating it is not proposed to include in the Russian commercial sphere of influence the old established British trade route from Baghdad to Kermanshah?

*MR. SPEAKER: That does not arise out of the Question on the Paper.

*MR. REES asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was aware that in the recent protracted Customs negotiations with Turkey, when his Majesty's Government were pressing for Custom facilities at the principal ports, the port of Baghdad, dealing with a British and Indian trade of over £1,000,000 a year, and the seat of a British Consulate-General, was entirely omitted from the negotiations by an oversight, and only included at the last moment as the result of unofficial prompting.

SIR EDWARD GREY: My recollection is that the arrangement with regard to Customs applied to all Ports. I have no recollection that the Port of Baghdad escaped notice.

The Hague Conference.

MR. ALDEN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any new instructions have been issued to British delegates at The Hague with reference to the question of commerce destruction; and whether Sir Earnest Satow's views on this subject correctly represent the attitude of the Government in relation to the immunity of private property.

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg at the same time to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the opposition of His Majesty's Plenipotentiaries at The Hague to the proposal to render private property at sea immune during naval warfare represents the opinions and was offered on the instructions of His Majesty's Government.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I conclude that this Question and the Question of the hon. Member for Leicester refer to the subject of enemy's private property at sea; the line taken by the British delegates at The Hague Conference is entirely in accord with the original instructions issued to them by His Majesty's Government for their guidance.

MR. ALDEN: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether it is possible to state in an authoritative form the instructions to the British delegates at The Hague Conference on the subject of contraband and blockade in time of war, since the British views have already become known with more or less incompleteness during the sittings of the Conference.

SIR EDWARD GREY: We cannot make any further statement than that which has already been allowed to become public by the Conference respecting its discussions. The part taken by the British delegates has been, and no doubt will continue to be, in accord with their instructions, but it would not be desirable to anticipate what future action they may have to take by publishing the instructions in advance.

Bristol Pilotage Dues.

MR. W. HOPE (Somersetshire, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that at the port of Bristol it is the practice of the local pilotage authority, when collecting pilotage dues payable upon a ship's tonnage, to abstain from adding to the ship's register tonnage the tonnage of the space occupied by deck cargo; and whether he will direct such local pilotage authorities to charge pilotage dues upon the additional tonnage representing deck cargo, in pursuance of Section 85 of The Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, in order that the pilots, on whose behalf such dues are collected, may receive an additional payment in respect of ships with deck cargoes, as directed by the said section.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): I am informed by the Corporation of Bristol, which is the pilotage authority there, that their practice is as described in the first part of the Question. The Board of Trade have no power to issue directions to a pilotage authority as suggested by my hon. friend, but I will communicate with the Bristol Corporation calling attention to the provisions of Section 85 of The Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, as affecting pilotage rates. It is, of course, open to any person interested to take action to enforce compliance with the law.

Telephonic and Telegraphic Rates in France.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he is now in a position to make any statement to the House with regard to a reduction in the telegraphic and telephonic charges between this country and France.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): The question of a reduction in the telegraphic and telephonic charges for communication between this country and France is now under examination; but there are difficulties, financial and other, and I cannot at present make any statement on the subject.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe) hoped the right hon. Gentleman would expedite the negotiations as much as possible.

Average School Attendance under Fifty.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if he can state the number of public elementary schools or school departments having an average attendance of less than fifty scholars, and the number having an average attendance of between fifty and sixty.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. McKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): I fear the labour involved in the compilation of these figures would be so great that I do not feel justified in undertaking it, especially at this time of the year when the ordinary work of preparing the annual statistical volume is exceptionally heavy.

Public Works Loans Bill.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he can now state when it is intended to introduce the Public Works Loans Bill.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury): It is hoped to introduce the Bill shortly.

Sugar Surtax.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what is the amount allowed, under the provisions of the Brussels Convention, to home-grown and manufactured sugar before a countervailing Excise Duty becomes automatically leviable.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The Brussels Convention provides that the surtax, *i.e.*, the amount by which the customs duty upon imported sugar may exceed the excise duty on that produced at home, shall not be greater than 6 francs per 100 kilograms upon refined, or 5·50 francs per 100 kilograms upon unrefined, sugar.

The Board of Agriculture.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he can state of whom that Board is composed; how often has that Board met within the last seven years; whether the Secretary or any of the Assistant Secretaries has the right to use the seal and so to pass orders on their own account; and, if so, will he grant a Return of all such orders passed by a Secretary or Assistant Secretary without reference to the President since the Board was constituted.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.): The Board consists of a President of the Council, the Principal Secretaries of State, the First Lord of the Treasury, the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, and the Secretary for Scotland. It has never yet met. The President of the Board is responsible for all the acts of his subordinates and no order—or indeed any other document—is issued except under his immediate authority or in pursuance of a general policy sanctioned by him. I am unable to grant the Return asked for by the hon. Member, but I have no objection to say that the issue of the order which has, I think, given rise to his Questions was personally sanctioned by the President.

Timber in Ireland.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Board of Agriculture (Ireland) whether the attention of his Department has been directed to the wholesale clearances of ornamental and useful timber being carried out by landowners (mainly absentees) throughout the country; whether steps will be taken to check them; and whether the time has come when a scheme of reafforestation might be favourably considered and given practical effect to.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR IRELAND (Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.): Yes, Sir. It is a fact that both landlords and tenants are cutting down timber in many parts of the country. The area under wood in 1895 was 308,928 acres. In 1905 it was 301,132, a decrease of 7,796 acres, and there is reason for believing that the rate has increased rather than decreased since 1905. Having consulted with the Chief Secretary, I propose to appoint a small Departmental Committee, not to consider the utility of afforestation, but to devise a scheme whereby, first, the mischief now going on may be checked, and, secondly, the best means of approaching the larger question of afforestation may be ascertained.

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.) asked whether steps would be taken immediately to preserve the woods of Dundrum, which were now in the hands of the Estates Commissioners.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I do not know about the woods in question, but I am aware that the Estates Commissioners will do everything in their power to preserve the woods.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.) asked whether the hon. Gentleman's Department had any power to purchase woods and plantations for the purpose of preserving timber.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: No, Sir.

Holywood District Council's Clerk.

MR. KILBRIDE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing that the Local Government Board of Ireland directed its auditor, Mr. W. E. Ellis, at the beginning of 1906, to hold an extraordinary audit of the accounts of the Holywood District Council in respect of sums of money obtained by James H. Barrett, formerly clerk to the council, for and on behalf of the council during a period of time from 1899 down to 1905, and not accounted for until the deficiencies were discovered in December, 1905, six months after Barrett's dismissal from his office of clerk, he will state the circumstances under which the Local Government Board of Ireland became aware of the deficiencies; whether the auditor has made any report or finding in the matter of the audit; and, if not, will he state the reason for the delay; will he state when Mr. W. E. Ellis was appointed auditor for the Local Government Board, what districts he has served in, and the cause of his removal from one district to another; whether he is aware that shortly after Mr. Ellis's removal to the Belfast district a Mr. John Smyth, of Belfast, made a declaration that Mr. W. E. Ellis had threatened to do certain acts in connection with the audit of the Belfast Asylums Board's accounts in a spirit of revenge against Dr. William Graham, the medical superintendent; and will he say whether the Belfast Asylums Board sent a deputation to the Local Government Board, or took other steps to secure the removal of Mr. W. E. Ellis as auditor; whether, seeing that signatures to a memorial asking the Local Government Board to retain Mr. Ellis were obtained by the said James H. Barrett on behalf of Mr. Ellis, will he say what steps were taken by the Local Government Board thereon; whether the Holywood Urban District Council has made further discoveries in respect of failures by James H. Barrett to account for other sums of money received by him for the council whilst clerk prior to May, 1905, disclosing an appropriation of moneys; and what steps the Local Government Board intend to take in the matter.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange; for Mr. BIRRELL): Mr. Barrett requested the Local Government Board to direct the auditor to extend the ordinary audit of the accounts of the Urban District Council for the year ending 31st March, 1905, so as to include an additional month, in order to enable Mr. Barrett to close his financial transactions with the Urban District Council, and the Board directed the auditor to hold an extraordinary audit accordingly. Dr. Ellis was appointed auditor in the year 1892. He has served in the Limerick, Dublin, Kerry, and Belfast districts, his transfer in each case being made for Departmental reasons. The Local Government Board cannot trace any record of the declaration stated in the Question to have been made by Mr. John Smyth, of Belfast. A deputation from the Belfast District Asylum Committee waited upon the Board towards the close of the year 1904, and among other matters asked that the same auditor who audited the Belfast County Borough should audit the asylum district accounts, as the district was coterminous with the borough, but the Board were unable to make this arrangement. It is the fact that a memorial was presented to the Board (in 1905) asking that Dr. Ellis should be retained in the Belfast District, but the Board have no information as to the circumstances under which the signatures to the memorial were obtained. The Board informed the memorialists that it was not intended to transfer the auditor to another district. The Board have no information as to the penultimate paragraph of the Question. They propose to take no further steps in any of the matters referred to in the Question, but they have approved of Mr. Barrett's dismissal as executive sanitary officer in connection with other charges preferred against him by the urban district council.

MR. KILBRIDE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that for four and a half years from the date of his appointment down to the 31st December, 1905, James H. Barrett, clerk of the Town Court of Holywood, charged the Urban District Council of Holywood and deducted out of moneys he had in hand of the council the sum of sixpence for the service of each summons for the town court, although the summonses were served gratuitously by the police; that the council called upon Sergeant Samuel Donaldson, who is in charge of the local police barracks, to hand over the originals of the summonses served during this period, which originals were the property of the council who were named as complainants in each, so that the evidence of service could be preserved (the mode of service being endorsed on the back of each summons); and that Sergeant Donaldson replied that he had then just destroyed them; and whether, seeing that, in consequence, Councillor James Shannon, a member of the council, personally investigated all the cases for the quarter ending 31st December, 1905, with the result that he found that the summonses in each case had been served by the police, he will say what authority Sergeant Donaldson had for destroying the summonses; and whether it is intended to take any action in the matter.

MR. CHERRY: The Local Government Board have ascertained from their auditor that it was Mr. Barrett's practice during the period mentioned to deduct from lodgments made by him for town court fines a sum of sixpence for the service of each summons. The summonses were served by the constabulary free of charge, but Mr. Barrett claims that he invariably paid over to the court summons server the fee for the service of each summons. The summonses in town court cases are not now served by the constabulary. The Inspector-General informs me that in March, 1906, as the result of a letter received from the Holywood Urban District Council, he inquired into the complaint against Sergeant Donaldson, and found that the sergeant had received from the clerk of the court summonses which had been disposed of, for the purpose of entering the particulars in the crime register, and had subsequently destroyed them as the clerk had informed him that the summonses were of no further use. The permanent record of the cases to which the summonses refer is contained in the order book of the court. The sergeant was instructed not to take any further summonses from the clerk, but to obtain the required particulars for the crime register from another source. The Inspector-General does not intend to take any further action regarding the sergeant.

Irish Department of Agriculture.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland can he state when the Minutes of Evidence of the Departmental Inquiry into the Irish Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction will be issued.

MR. CHERRY: I understand from His Majesty's Stationery Office that the Minutes of Evidence are in the printer's hands, and will be ready for distribution within a fortnight.

Boycotting in Leitrim.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): On behalf of the hon. and gallant Member for East Down, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland how many persons in the neighbourhood of Drumkeeran, county Leitrim, are boycotted; how many miles have these boycotted persons to travel to obtain the bare necessities of life, have their horses shod, and dispose of their stock; the reason why they are boycotted; and the number of police employed for their protection.

MR. CHERRY: The police authorities inform me that there are in the neighbourhood of Drumkeeran two cases of serious boycotting, comprising eight persons. These persons have to go about twelve miles to have their horses shod, twenty miles to obtain provisions, and twenty-four miles to dispose of their stock. The persons concerned are holders and caretakers respectively of evicted farms. There are no police employed solely for the protection of these people, but eleven extra police are stationed in Drumkeeran and one of their duties is to afford protection to persons who need it.

Tullaroan Evicted Tenant.

MR. MEAGHER (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state if the Estates Commissioners have yet investigated the application of the representatives of Richard Walsh, of Picketstown, Tullaroan, county Kilkenny, who were evicted from their holding at Knucknamuck Maher's estate; and, if so, what steps, if any, have been taken for their restoration to their own or an equivalent holding.

MR. CHERRY: The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have recently received their inspector's report upon Mrs. Walsh's application for restoration to the holding from which her late husband was evicted, but they have not yet made any ruling in the matter.

Urlingford Evicted Tenant.

Mr. MEAGHER: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state whether the Estate Commissioners have yet investigated the claim of the representatives of Thomas Kennedy, The Islands, Urlingford, county Kilkenny, who were evicted from their holding on the Mountgarret estate; and, if so, what steps, if any, have been taken for their restoration to their own or an equivalent holding.

Mr. CHERRY: The Estates Commissioners have inquired into Mrs. Kennedy's application for reinstatement. The present occupiers of the holding are not willing to surrender it, and the Commissioners therefore have not been able to arrange for the applicant's restoration.

Labourers' Cottage Schemes.

Mr. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the statement made frequently in correspondence emanating from the Labourers Department of the Local Government Board, to the effect that it is open to any agricultural labourers whose claims for cottages and allotments have been rejected by the rural district councils to appear before the inspector at the local inquiry, implies that such labourers can have their rejected representations inquired into and the reasons why they were excluded from the benefits of the Labourers Acts thoroughly investigated; and will he state what rule or clause or section of any of the Labourers Acts empowers the Local Government Board to declare that an inspector is not empowered to enlarge an improvement scheme by the addition of cottages and plots unjustly rejected by the district council.

Mr. CHERRY: I would refer to my right hon. friend's Answer to the Question put by the hon. Member for West Clare on the 3rd instant.† Section 6 (1) of the Labourers Act of last year provides that the inspector shall consider all objections made by any persons interested, including any agricultural labourers by whom or on whose behalf representations have been made. The view taken by the Local Government Board of the effect of this section is that the investigation which the inspector is empowered to make into rejected claims should be directed to ascertaining and reporting as to the sufficiency or otherwise of the scheme as a whole rather than as to the action of the council in rejecting individual cases. They do not consider that he is intended to act as a court of appeal from the decision of the council in each case, inasmuch as he has no power to make any addition to the lands proposed in the scheme to be taken compulsorily.

Grange Shooting Outrage.

Colonel LOCKWOOD: On behalf of the hon. Member for Mid. Armagh, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received reports of a shooting outrage at Grange, county Galway, at the house of a man named John Costelloe, who took possession of a grazing farm on the estate of Lambert Minors; and whether any arrests have been made.

Mr. CHERRY: The police authorities inform me that they have fully investigated this alleged shooting outrage, and are satisfied that there is absolutely no foundation for the rumour.

The Member for North Mayo and the Crannagh Farm.

Colonel LOCKWOOD: On behalf of the hon. Member for Mid. Armagh, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at a meeting of the United Irish League at Ardagh, county Mayo, on Sunday, a resolution was adopted condemning John Haire, who was described as the infamous grabber of Crannagh farm; whether he is aware that the hon. Member for North Mayo publicly advised the people to boycott Haire absolutely, vigorously, completely, and exhaustively; and what action he proposes to take in the matter.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Has the hon. Member for North Mayo been warned that this question attacking him would be put?

*Mr. SPEAKER: I have not the faintest idea.

Colonel LOCKWOOD: Neither have I.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxvii., 701-2.

MR. CHERRY: I have seen a newspaper Report of the meeting referred to. It is, however, only right to say that according to this report the hon. Member for North Mayo explained that by boycotting he meant picketting as employed in England, and he told his hearers that there must be no violence and not the least infraction of the law. My right hon. friend has already stated that John Haire is receiving all necessary police protection and no further action appears to be necessary for the present at all events.

Abbeyleix Unlawful Assembly Prosecution.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD: On behalf of the hon. Member for Mid. Armagh, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the proceedings at the hearing of a charge against twenty-three men of unlawful assembly at the Abbeyleix Petty Sessions Court on Saturday; what was the finding of the Court; and whether all the justices who adjudicated were appointed for the district in which they were sitting.

MR. CHERRY: The charge against three of the men referred to in the Question was dismissed for want of identification. The magistrates were equally divided in opinion upon the case as regards the remaining twenty defendants, and the case was therefore adjourned till the 20th instant, when it will be further heard. I am informed that all of the ten magistrates present were qualified to sit at Abbeyleix Petty Sessions.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL asked whether it was in accordance with order and etiquette for a Member to ask a Question notice of which appeared in the name of another Member, except at the request of the latter.

*MR. SPEAKER: It is quite in order for a Member to ask a Question on behalf of and at the request of another Member, as has been the case in this instance. In an instance which occurred yesterday the hon. Member for Rutland informs me that he was asked to put the Question.†

COLONEL LOCKWOOD: Is there anything improper in one hon. Member at the express request of another asking a Question for him?

*MR. SPEAKER: Nothing whatever.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD: That is all I have done. I have been specially requested by the hon. Members for East Down and Mid. Armagh to put their Questions to-day.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: When a Question was put in the same way yesterday the Minister who replied stated that he had written to the hon. Member in whose name it stood asking him to postpone it. That seemed to indicate that the Question was not asked by special request.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: In one case my noble friend asked me only half an hour before to put a Question on his behalf.

Kerry Fair Rent Courts.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state when the last Sub-Commission Court to fix fair rents, sat at Listowel, North Kerry; when will the decisions of the Sub-Commissioners be given; and where will they be published.

MR. CHERRY: The Land Commission inform me that in order to answer this Question they find it necessary to communicate with the Chairman of the Sub-Commission referred to, who is absent on duty in the country. As soon as I receive the necessary information I will acquaint the hon. Member with the facts.

The "Forest Hall."

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in view of the fact that a sworn declaration, made by Patrick Gallivan as to the circumstances in which the "Forest Hall" was saved from being wrecked on 20th April in the Kenmare River, had been submitted to him, that the captain of the vessel asked Patrick Gallivan to convey her to a safe harbour as she was then in distress and drifting close to Moylaun Island, and that

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxvii., 1619.

Patrick Gallivan is precluded by his position in life from embarking on costly proceedings in a court of law to obtain salvage, he will take the necessary steps to secure that adequate compensation is given to Patrick Gallivan by the owners of the "Forest Hall."

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: As I informed my hon. friend in reply to a Question on the 7th June last, this matter is not one in regard to which the Board of Trade have any power to intervene.

Swine Fever at Carlow.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, with reference to the alleged case of swine fever said to have been traced to Carlow on 21st November, 1905, and to the fact that the general inquiries as to the health of the swine in that district were made with negative results, can he state on whose diagnosis was swine fever declared, and was the examination in this case an ordinary one.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The diagnosis in this case was made by the veterinary officers of the Board in accordance with the ordinary procedure.

Parliament and Egypt.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether His Majesty's Government will give at least one day in every session for the discussion of Egyptian affairs, so that the House and the country may more thoroughly realise their responsibilities and better discharge their duties to Egypt as long as the British occupation continues.

*MR. REES: Before the Prime Minister answers, will he say whether there is any justification for the inference contained in the Question that the country does not thoroughly realise and thoroughly discharge its duties towards Egypt?

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): I have no wish to underrate the importance of Egypt, but neither in Foreign nor Colonial affairs has it been the custom of the Government to select individual subjects connected with these Departments and to allocate a special day to them as a matter of annual procedure. In view of the great and varying demands made upon the time of the House I do not see my way to depart from this practice. Very full information is laid before Parliament every year in the report of His Majesty's Consul-General at Cairo and there are each session several opportunities for discussing it.

Sir James Brown Smith.

MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he is aware that Mr. James Brown Smith, Clifford Park, Stirling, one of the new knights gazetted in the birthday honours list of last month, was a director of the Ayrshire Foundry Company during the time the latter company fraudulently supplied a defective rudder for H.M.S. "King Edward VII."; and whether it is proposed to take any action against him.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Sir James Smith is a man entirely worthy of the recognition which his public services have received and enjoying the respect of all who knew him to whatever class or party they belong. I have inquired and find that he was a director of the Ayrshire Foundry Company at the time when the circumstances referred to occurred. But he and his fellow directors had no knowledge whatever of the offence which was being committed by their servant or servants, and for which they themselves have suffered a heavy pecuniary loss. The Law Officers of the Crown after careful consideration declined to take any action against the company.

MR. BELLOC (Salford, S.): May I ask whether the name of the servant of this gentleman, for whom he is responsible, can be given to the House?

MR. LEA: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman if it was in consequence of Mr. Smith having been a prominent supporter of the Prime Minister, and acting with the Stirling Liberal Association as chairman of the right hon. Gentleman's election committee, or whether it was in consequence of his having been a director of the Ayrshire Foundry Company, by whom this fraudulent rudder was supplied, or whether it was in consequence of his having paid over money to the Liberal Party Fund, that he was knighted?

*MR. SPEAKER: Questions cannot be asked of the Prime Minister as to his responsibility for any advice he might give to the Sovereign in the recommendation of honours.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I think I can safely leave it to the House to judge.

MR. LEA subsequently asked when an opportunity would arise for discussing the Ayrshire Foundry Company's contract.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) reminded the Prime Minister that the subject would arise on the Report of the Public Accounts Committee for the discussion of which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had expressed a strong opinion that an opportunity should be given.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said he would look into that and any promise given should be adhered to.

MR. LEA asked Mr. Speaker if it would be in order to discuss the question of the knighthood conferred on a director of the Ayrshire Foundry Company.

*MR. SPEAKER said a question of order in Committee was for the decision of the Chairman.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Might not the creation of a few more knights settle the matter?

MR. LEA: Will this democratic Government consider the advisability of publishing a tariff before recommending any more people for knighthood?

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member had better give notice of his Question.

Radiotelegraph Convention.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he will consider the expediency of affording the House an opportunity for a debate on the Report of the Select Committee on the Radiotelegraphic Convention.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I understand that the Report was only issued this morning, and I have therefore not yet been able to examine it. As the House had an opportunity of discussing this question which led to the appointment of a Select Committee, I think it unlikely that further time can be given.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he was aware that the Report of the Select Committee was dissented from by a very substantial minority of the Committee, and whether that did not point to the expediency of affording the House an opportunity of expressing its opinion on the subject.

SIR GILBERT PARKER also pointed out that some of the members who signed the majority Report differed from their colleagues on some particulars.

MR. GWYNN (Galway) urged that there was a strong desire even on the part of the Committee for further discussion of this very complex subject.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN thought that, as the Government had met the desire of the House by appointing a Committee of inquiry, and as every opportunity had been afforded to the Committee for investigating the subject, they could not give any more Parliamentary time to it, considering the period of the Session and the pressure of business.

The Grant to Lord Cromer.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Prime Minister if there is any precedent and, if so, what, for the proposal to give a public grant of money to a Civil servant who is already entitled to a pension; and whether, in the event of such a proposal being made in reference to Lord Cromer, ample notice will be given before any Resolution is made in the House.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Yes, Sir, there have been cases varying in amount and circumstances; and with regard to the second part of the Question ample notice would no doubt, in such an event, be given.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman bear in mind that the opposition to this grant will not be confined to Members on this side, there being many on his own side who will also object to it?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not know what opposition there may be until the time comes.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would give him the reference to the precedents for such a grant, so that he might examine them.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: There is one important precedent which is really analogous in every respect, and the date and circumstances of it I will convey to the hon. Gentleman.

Tax on Titles.

MR. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, before advising His Majesty to confer any further Peerages or other honours upon commoners, he will consider the desirableness of instituting a tax on titles, and applying the proceeds of such tax in aid of the scheme of the Chancellor of the Exchequer for establishing the commencement of the nucleus of the fund for old-age pensions.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: This Question seems to be one which ought rather to have been addressed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It suggests a new tax. I have no doubt he will consider the suggestion with any others.

Electoral Anomalies.

MR. DUNN (Cornwall, Camborne): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he is aware that a number of Members of the present Parliament have been returned at elections in which the majority of the electors voting thereat have recorded votes against their return by voting in favour of other candidates, and that since the last General Election five Members have been so returned at bye-elections; and whether he will consider the advisability of promoting remedial legislation.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I believe that the facts are as stated by my hon. friend; and when the time arrives for dealing with the various matters affecting our electoral system which stand in need of change, the question of remedying the state of things to which he calls my attention will, no doubt, receive due consideration.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) asked what business would be taken next week.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said on Monday it was proposed to take the discussion on the Motion in reference to Colonial preference, on Tuesday the Report Stage of the Finance Bill, on Wednesday the Committee on the Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, on Thursday Home Office and Local Government Votes in Committee of Supply.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD said the annual report of the factory inspector had only been delivered to-day; it was voluminous, and many Members desired to make themselves acquainted with its contents before the Home Office Vote came on for discussion.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN thought that in this cool weather a week would be sufficient for the purpose.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C:—Sir George Doughty; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Harrison-Broadley.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had added the following Member to Standing Committee C:—Mr. Howard.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

SUPPLY [16TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1907-8.

CLASS IV.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,593,646, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the salaries and expenses of the Board of Education, and of the various establishments connected therewith, including grants for the building of new public elementary schools and sundry Grants in Aid."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said it had been intimated by the Minister in charge that it was not his intention to begin the discussion by a statement of the education policy of the Government. Great inconvenience must ensue from following that course. One of the predecessors of the right hon. Gentleman in the Radical Government of 1894 stated that it was the invariable practice on the Education Vote for the Minister to make a statement upon the general policy of the Department; and, if the right hon. Gentleman would look through the records of years succeeding that declaration made by Mr. Acland, he would find that whenever the Education Vote was considered of sufficient importance to be made the first order of the day the invariable rule had been for the Minister to begin with a statement. If that ever were desirable it was doubly and trebly desirable on the present occasion, not simply because they were voting £13,000,000, as compared with only £6,000,000 dealt with by Mr. Acland, but because it was understood that the right hon. Gentleman was initiating in more than one important branch of his administration new procedure, which, in the absence of any explanation from the Minister in charge, seemed to be not only grossly unjust, but grossly unconstitutional. Let them take the item of £100,000 which stood sixth on the list of items, and of which they learned that it was a special grant for the building of new public elementary schools. He understood the view of the Government to be that there ought to be new elementary schools in certain unspecified parishes in certain unspecified counties where at present there were only single schools, and those of a denominational character. He had always admitted the single school area grievance. It existed equally where those who wished undenominational education could only find a denominational school and where those who desired denominational education could only find an undenominational school; and he would gladly relieve parents of this grievance, whatever their views as to the religious or non-religious education of their children. But the right hon. Gentleman's whole method of dealing with the situation seemed to him to be utterly wrong and utterly unconstitutional in more ways than one. When the last Government desired to assist schools suffering from what was justly called an intolerable strain, a Bill was introduced which practically did no more in regard to those schools than the right hon. Gentleman proposed to do by this Vote for the unspecified schools with which he proposed to deal. The opportunities of discussing this £100,000 would be limited to a portion of a single night's discussion, which would range over a variety of questions, for it was improbable that another night would be given to the Education Vote, whereas the Bill to which he referred took three days on the Second Reading, eighteen or nineteen days in Committee, and a day on the Third Reading—in all twenty-two days. The right hon. Gentleman proposed, in the course of one miscellaneous discussion, to deal with the whole of an analogous question, the only difference being that he proposed to make a subvention out of the money of the general taxpayers, many of whom might or might not approve of his policy, whereas the Bill of 1897 was definite and elaborate in its proposal and was exposed to the full fire of Parliamentary criticism. To reply that the discussion on the Appropriation Bill would afford an opportunity was really asking the House to deprive itself of one of its most valued privileges of devoting that occasion to a general survey of the Government's policy and criticism of its past conduct. It was impossible on the Appropriation Bill to get the decision of the House as to the propriety of this item, for the only way would be to vote against the Second or Third Reading of the Appropriation Bill, a course which, if successful, would necessarily turn out the Government and cause great inconvenience to the administration if it did not bring it to a standstill. That was not nearly all. Perhaps the House was not fully aware that by the Act of 1870 it was distinctly laid down that no public money should be given for the erection or equipment of any elementary school, so that the Government now, by a Vote in Supply subsequently embodied in an Appropriation Bill, proposed to over-ride, without repealing, an explicit provision of an Act of Parliament. He might have to ask the Chairman of Committees at some later stage to give his decision as to whether that was in order. Was it not obvious that it was the grossest violation of the ordinary practice and legitimate procedure of the House? It became worse when it was remembered that the Education Department were absolute masters of this £100,000, which they could use exactly as they liked, when they liked, and where they liked. If the Unionists had been in office and had put down a Vote in these terms, he took it that it would have been absolutely in the power of the then Minister of Education, the Member for Oxford University, as it would be in the power of the right hon. Gentleman himself, to use this money for building any kind of school. Nothing was laid down by statute limiting the use of the £100,000. They did not know whether it was going to Wales or to England, to the West Riding of Yorkshire, or the county of Carnarvon. If the right hon. Gentleman bound himself by any Ministerial statement he could not bind his successors.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr McKENNA, Monmouth, N.) said that an ample explanation had been given on the Consolidated Fund Bill.†

MR. A. J. BALFOUR did not agree, and the dubious tone and language of the Attorney-General on that occasion was such as to show on what thin ice they stood, and how important was the constitutional problem the right hon. Gentleman had chosen thus recklessly to raise. He hoped the Prime Minister would consider all the consequences to which this precedent might lead when any future Government found itself in a position in which it was its duty to assist any class of school. It would not again find it to be its duty to go through all the formalities that were gone through in 1897. This simpler procedure, if sanctioned by the House under his *ægis*, must become a precedent for all time. That was the first point on which he thought the right hon. Gentleman should have given a full and frank explanation to the House, and he hoped he would either himself or through the mouth of his Law Officers tell the Committee what the position would be when the Appropriation Bill was passed, including this £100,000 for primary elementary schools, while the Act of 1870 remained unrepealed. They would have an Act still in full vigour and force declaring that no public money be given to public elementary schools, while they would have passed an Act giving money to public elementary schools. Both Acts would be living and operative and would have to be taken into account in any proceedings that might be taken before the Courts. This would be the first occasion on which the House, knowing exactly what it was doing, put on the Statute-book an Act which left unrepealed another Act which was wholly inconsistent with its provisions. He now passed to the Vote, with the object of which, if administered impartially, he had great sympathy. He sympathised with any attempt to meet the wishes of the parents, whether they desired undenominational teaching or denominational teaching. His objection was not so much to the expenditure of £100,000 if it were to be impartially applied, but to the constitutional error which he thought the right hon. Gentleman had made, and the new course into which he was, wittingly or unwittingly, leading the House. He next came to two Votes as to which he could not say that he sympathised with the right hon. Gentleman. He understood that the right hon. Gentleman had declared it as part of his policy to prevent any hostel being added to a training college—to prevent a denominational hostel being added to an undenominational college or an undenominational hostel to a denominational college. The right hon. Gentleman had absolutely put his foot down on that as a fundamental part of his policy, and he understood that to be in direct contradiction of his immediate predecessor, the Chief Secretary for Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman had made that a question of policy, and in that he thought he was profoundly wrong. The right hon. Gentleman might say it was right, but could he say that of that part of his policy which practically deprived denominations which had built training colleges of the use of those colleges? It was not the first time that the right hon. Gentleman and his friends had first encouraged denominations to spend denominational money for some denominational object, and then turned round and appropriated the results of their liberality and public spirit and turned them to wholly different purposes. The right hon. Gentleman might not be able to agree that their objects were meritorious, but, at all events, these denominations, with encouragement from that House, had undertaken the whole cost of building training colleges. [MINISTERIAL cries of "No."] Yes, he thought the whole cost. At any rate, nobody could deny that they had borne by far the greater part of the cost. That was universally admitted. These training colleges fulfilled a function which was of absolutely vital importance, not from the denominational or religious educational point of view, but from the secular educational point of view. The Government now came forward and said, "We find this or that denomination has been zealous and public-spirited enough to build training colleges, primarily, of course, for those who agree with them in religion. Let us take them, or at all events make arrangements by which they can be taken and appropriated by those who differ from the intentions of the donors and subscribers, to whom the State owes a profound debt of gratitude and for whom we must have the warmest sympathy, respect, and regard." He thought that was utterly wrong, and he would be tempted to dwell on it at greater length if there was not a worse case of Governmental intolerance and injustice. In some of the secondary schools which received a Government grant denominational teaching was given, and in others it was not. The right hon. Gentleman proposed for the first time to differentiate between these schools and, without legislative authority, to penalise those which provided the education which was presumably desired by the parents of the children who went to them. But the Government recognised that a great many of these denominational schools, which were founded and worked by the generosity of individual benefactors and donors, were bound by the character of the trust deeds to give religous education of a certain type to meet the needs of the parents who held religion of that type. The right hon. Gentleman was by a kind of legislative inheritance the successor of the old Charity Commission, which in former times arranged the way in which these schools should carry on their work. No doubt the right hon. Gentleman had power to alter those arrangements, and he was bribing those denominational schools who preferred to adhere to the charter their trust deed settled for them —he was, on the authority of that House, bribing—or rather fining—these schools to abandon their trust deed in order that they might get a little more public money. He called that disgraceful. He knew nothing like it since the seventeenth century. The right hon. Gentleman literally and strictly, so far as he understood the matter, proposed to fine people for holding certain religious opinions, and he was not aware that that had been done since the seventeenth century. It rested with the present holders of office, who represented religious freedom as it was understood by Radicals, to make this new departure. He thought the folly of it was almost equal to the intolerable pity of it. Was it not obvious that, if the right hon. Gentleman, simply by manipulating the Votes, could fine those who held certain religious opinions, when a Minister for Education who held different opinions came into office, he could easily repay by another Vote all the arrears illegitimately withheld from these people by the right hon. Gentleman's Government? He trusted that kind of reversal of policy would never be rendered necessary by any such violent procedure as that he had spoken of. But if they were to have Committee of Supply used for purposes which violated every sound doctrine of justice and equality, if they were to have the proceedings in Committee of Supply used to carry out these nefarious purposes, the same Committee of Supply, under different leaders and in different circumstances, must undoubtedly be invoked to repair the injustices of their predecessors. He would gladly have withheld these remarks had the right hon. Gentleman followed the invariable practice and condescended to explain his policy, and perhaps justified it to the Committee. He could only speak from the necessarily imperfect information at his command; but the House would feel, and he thought the right hon. Gentleman would feel, that he could not longer withhold the desired information, which might have saved all this trouble. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would meet the request he made, in no hostile or factious spirit, that he should give the Committee his policy now and at once; but in order to make it clear he moved, he hoped only *pro forma*, to report Progress.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxi., 975–6; 978–82.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Mr. McKENNA said he could assure the right hon. Gentleman that in not following the usual practice of making a statement it was not with any intention of being discourteous, but solely with a view of saving time on a day on which they had an enormous amount of ground to cover. He had thought it better to hear what hon. Gentlemen had to say before making any observations. The right hon. Gentleman's speech was an exact illustration of his difficulty. The two chief subjects to which he had referred were subjects to which, in stating the policy of the Board, he would have devoted very little time. In the first place, he had already fully explained the policy of the Board with regard to the £100,000 on the Vote on Account; and, secondly, they had fully debated the secondary regulations on a Motion made by one of his hon. friends. He read at that time to the House the regulations covering all the points which the right hon. Gentleman had raised. It was on that very ground that he thought it would be more convenient to hon. Members if he did not take up an hour or an hour and a half with a preliminary statement at that time of the day, and then again absorb a great deal of time later in answering criticisms. There was a further reason why he had taken this course. The regulations, whether for secondary schools or training colleges this year had prefatory memoranda which clearly stated the policy of the Board. His speech could only have been a repetition of those printed statements, and he appealed, therefore, to the Committee to support the view he had taken, that it was far better that he should be allowed an opportunity of hearing what might be the criticisms and points which he had not cleared up in those memoranda than that he should occupy the time of the House by making a speech now.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 97; Noes, 196. (Division List No. 275.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Acland-Hood,RtHn.Sir Alex.F
Ambrose, Robert
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,RtHn.A.J.(City Lond.)
Beach,Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boland, John
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Burke, E. Haviland-
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A. (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings,Rt.Hn.J (Birmingham
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, T. L (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Devlin, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan,Robert (Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fletcher, J. S.
Flynn, James Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Ginnell, L.
Gretton, John
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Hardy,Laurence (Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hayden, John Patrick
Heaton, John Henniker
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Hunt, Rowland
Joyce, Michael

Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meagher, Michael
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Mooney, J. J.
Morpeth, Viscount
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Armitage, R.
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Idris, T. H. W.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncaster
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
ODonnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradford
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Sears, J. E.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)

Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Ward,W.Dudley (Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wilson, John (Druham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Original Question again proposed.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University) said the President of the Board of Education had departed from a custom which was very convenient to the House, and which he had always himself observed when he was responsible for the Department. Their prefatory memoranda were issued in the ordinary course, but, admirable as they were as literary compositions, they were not sufficient to elucidate points which they expected to hear fully explained by the Minister. The most serious matter which they had to discuss was one which the President said he would dismiss in a very few words, namely, the exercise of the power of regulation to legislate, and to legislate so as to impose religious disabilities. The money which Parliament voted for secondary schools and training colleges was voted to promote secondary education and the training of teachers for public elementary schools. It was not meant to enable the President of the Board of Education to advance his own religious or political opinions, and in that way to divert or alter the character of schools and colleges, the money for the encouragement of which was entrusted to him for the time being. He would further say that wherever religious disabilities or religious requirements were imposed on the use of Parliamentary Grants for the provision of educational institutions, those requirements had been imposed by Act of Parliament. The Cowper-Temple Clause, which was Clause 14 of the Act of 1870, forbade catechisms and formularies distinctive of religious denominations to be used in any school provided by the local authority. Clause 4 of the Act of 1902 forbade local authorities to provide any schools except subject to the provisions of the Cowper-Temple Clause. That was really to protect the local authorities from the possible discord which would arise if they were able to provide schools, elementary or secondary, for one denomination or another. Under the Charity Trusts Act, and the Endowed Schools Act, the greatest care was taken that existing denominational institutes should be protected in the framing of schemes. Clause 19 of the Endowed Schools Act declared that its provisions were not to affect any educational endowment in which the scholars were required to learn or be instructed in the formulæ of a particular denomination, and no scheme was to make any provision as to religious instruction of the scholars except with the consent of the governing body. To return to Clause 4 of the Act of 1902, it expressly forbade local authorities in giving money to existing institutions, schools, colleges or hostels other than elementary and not provided by them, to require that any particular religious teaching should or should not be given or that any particular religious observances should or should not be kept. These were the statutory provisions, and they seemed to him to tie the hands of the Board, if it wished to carry out the spirit of those statutes, from interfering with the religious instruction in schools except for the purpose of carrying out the express provisions of the Act. The Board of Education, under whatever rule it had been, whether Radical or Conservative, had always kept themselves absolutely clear of religious questions in the apportionment of grants. What were the Board doing now ? They were imposing by regulations a Cowper-Temple Clause on secondary schools and training colleges, and they were doing this by departmental documents which had not to lie on the Table of the House. Not only that, but they were using their powers as Charity Commissioners to compel or induce the governors of secondary schools to bring up the trust deeds or schemes or instruments of foundation to the Board to get them altered, so as to introduce the Cowper-Temple Clause and various other religious disabilities under pain of the loss of part of the grant offered by the Board of Education. The Board of Education were going to do what local authorities were expressly forbidden from doing, namely, to differentiate between one school and another on religious grounds. Local authorities were forbidden to require that any form of religious instruction should or should not be given or observances followed, but the Board of Education were going to do this, and why? Was there any religious difficulty in the secondary schools? Had any parents complained? Had local authorities complained? They had clamoured for larger representation, but had they alleged that there was any religious difficulty? He challenged the President of the Board of Education to point out any case in which any religious difficulty had arisen in secondary schools. The right hon. Gentleman was doing this to gratify his Nonconformist supporters, and not to benefit education or the students. It was being done not at the invitation of the local authorities but to satisfy the clamour of the Nonconformist clique who were largely represented in the House of Commons. What was the present situation in regard to the training colleges? How far were the Board of Education and the country indebted to the denominations for the provision of institutions for the training of teachers? There were at this moment fifty-one recognised training colleges. How many of them were undenominational? Only ten were undenominational, thirty-two were provided by the Church of England, seven by the Roman Catholics, and two by the Wesleyans. The Government, it was true, provided the maintenance, but what was the good of that if there was not a college for the students to go to? Who provided the colleges? The denominations were the first in the field, otherwise there would have been very few colleges for training teachers.

SIR G KEKEWICH (Exeter): They were built with the aid of State grants.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON: No. There had not been any building grants since 1870. The hon. Member for Exeter would have done well to remember that a great many of those colleges had been built since 1870, and those built before that date must have cost a large sum to repair and equip for modern requirements.

SIR G. KEKEWICH: And many of them have not been repaired yet.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that if there was one thing more than another which was urgent in regard to elementary education it was to obtain a better supply of competent teachers. Now it was proposed that one source—the only source for a good many years—was to be cut off. What about the colleges now in existence? They were to be appropriated by persons who intended to frustrate the objects for which those colleges were built. At present the colleges selected their own students. The Board of Education had taken minute care—which was almost ludicrous when they came to read it—that the heads of the college were not to have any voice in the selection of the pupils. No application was to be received before a certain date, every application, as the letter was opened, was to be recorded and registered and open for the inspection of the Board of Education. If the student was not accepted in the order in which his application was opened the Board of Education would intervene, and the college would have to show cause why he had not been accepted, and might be mulcted in a considerable amount of the grant, or, for a second offence, refused recognition altogether. A mass of applications might be deliberately sent in by persons anxious to flood the college with Nonconformist students, and the letters would have to be opened and the students admitted in the order in which they were received. Many of those colleges were held under trust deeds which required that religious instruction of a particular kind should be given there. What would happen now? They might get a Roman Catholic or a Church of England college filled with students who would alter the whole character of the college, who would decline to receive the religious instruction provided, or attend the religious observances for which the college was founded. They might get enough of this class of students to destroy the discipline of the college if not its entire character. Some of the colleges would not be able to receive the grants for the students who would not take the religious instruction and the college would very likely have to be closed in consequence. Nevertheless the teachers would have to be trained somewhere and the burden would fall upon the local education authority. In the past they had heard a good many eloquent speeches upon the great merits of the undenominational religious instruction given in the council schools. That teaching was very good of its kind, but it should not be forgotten that most of the teachers who gave that instruction had been trained in Church of England training colleges, and consequently, by adopting these regulations they would not merely affect the supply of teachers, but they would affect the character and quality of the religious teaching given in the elementary schools, because the students would no longer receive the religious instruction they had been accustomed to receive in the post. He understood the purport of the new regulations to be this, that a denominational hostel must not be attached to an undenominational training college. So that where a local authority did not desire to build a training college of its own but desired to use the training college established by a denomination, yet wished to build an hostel for the benefit of its own students, that hostel would no longer be recognised for grants. That seemed unjust on the face of it, and it was not in accord with the declaration of the right hon. Gentleman's predecessor, who, speaking to a deputation last year, deliberately assured them that he recognised the desirability of having the two kinds of hostel, a denominational hostel in connection with an undenominational college, and *vice versâ*, and added that he would do all he could to see that these hostels had a fair chance. That was the policy of the Board last year, and he desired to know for what reason and to what extent it had been changed. He hoped that the Committee would consider that this imposition of religious disabilities by the mere act of a Department, and contrary to the spirit of existing legislation, was not a matter to be dismissed in a few words by the President of the Board of Education. In regard to secondary schools, the Board required as one of the conditions of a grant that there should be a majority of representative governors. That would probably involve an alteration of the scheme, and it was another instance in which the Board of Education was using its powers as a dispenser of grants to bring the recipients of the grants within its grip, and to compel the governors to bring up their schemes for alteration under pain of losing half the grant. In this matter of local representation the local authorities had taken pretty good care of themselves. Why should the Board step in to help people who were perfectly well able to help themselves, and why should it insist that the local authority, when it had not built the school or contributed to its maintenance, should have a majority of representative governors, or else the school should only have half the grant to which it would otherwise be entitled? Was the Board altogether satisfied with the government of these schools by the local authority? On the contrary, it was quite clear that they had considerable grounds for dissatisfaction. It was stated that excessive powers of government were given to the organising secretary, that the schools were not really supervised by the local authority, and that the latter were apt to consider that the only instruction worth having was scientific and technical instruction. Then to impose, as the Board of Education was now doing, a hard and fast requirement that 25 per cent. of the places in secondary schools must be kept free for children from the elementary schools would risk the financial position of the secondary schools, would very likely lower their standard of teaching, and would not profit, but rather would very often fatigue and embarrass, the unfortunate children who were sent up to occupy these places. What was most needed was to provide schools suited to carry on and develop the work of the elementary school, not to send boys and girls from one school to another with no regard to suitableness or to the capacity of the child. He noticed that Wales was excluded from the operation of the Code issued by the Board of Education. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would explain to what extent he considered himself responsible, under the new arrangement in regard to Wales, for the government of the elementary schools in Wales, and what Code would be applied to Wales. Was there any probability that the provision of this Code would be made to apply to Wales in the course of time? They knew that there were many burning questions in Wales as regarded elementary schools, and it was therefore of great importance to those interested in voluntary schools in Wales to know what the conditions were there. There was another matter which might in some localities inflict hardships, and that was the striking out of the 8-feet per child limit in the elementary schools. He did not suppose anyone quarrelled with the desire of the Board—it was a desire which he shared—that children should have full space for the prosecution of their studies in comfort. He had no doubt that in a great part of the country the requirement would not work hardly. Certainly, in rural districts the accommodation provided was often in excess of the school attendance, and therefore there would be no difficulty to meet the present requirements of the Board there; but there would no doubt be cases in towns, and possibly even in the country, in which a sudden call upon a school, whether voluntary or Board school, to meet this 10-feet requirement would produce hardship. Children might have to be taken out of schools to which they were attached and which their parents wished them to attend and have to go to other schools which their parents did not desire them to attend. He therefore expressed the hope that the new rule, or rather the omission from the Code of this year of the rule which was involved, would be exercised in a spirit of fairness. What he regarded, however, of most importance was the topic on which he had already dwelt, and which the President of the Board of Education had dismissed with a smile and the waving of his hand—the introduction of the practice of legislation by regulation. The President of the Board of Education was imposing requirements as to religious teaching or the observance of religious teaching which imposed disabilities as conditions of grant: what one Board of Education did, however, another might undo. There was a great deal in the requirements which he considered unjust, and he should have no hesitation in doing his best to undo them if occasion offered; and to introduce into Departmental Government practices which would produce see-saw administration, leaving one Government to undo the work of another Government, would be a most unfortunate thing. If these changes were to be made, they should be made by legislation. The House ought to have full opportunity of considering whether training colleges and secondary schools were to be provided with a Cowper-Temple clause which by legislation had been imposed upon all elementary schools and all secondary schools provided by the local educational authority and the House should say whether the Board of Education was to be allowed to do what the local authority was forbidden to do, which was to differentiate between different classes of schools in relation to grants in accordance with the religious teaching there given. These were serious matters which they ought never to have been invited to discuss without a full explanation of the policy of the President of the Board of Education. They were discussing them under a disadvantage. He hoped he was not doing the President of the Board of Education an injustice when he told him that he was departing from the universal practice of the Board and running counter to the spirit, if not the letter, of a whole series of statutes.

*MR. S. T. EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid.) said the speech just delivered by the hon. Baronet was just the kind of speech they would have expected from the representative of the late Government at the Education Office. The greater portion of the speech was taken up with the question of the secondary schools and training colleges. He did not propose to attempt to deal with his arguments with reference to the secondary schools, because he took greater interest in the intermediate schools of Wales than in the secondary schools of England and he would only point out that there never had been any religious difficulty in their intermediate schools, because in them they had practically the spirit of the regulations which they saw in the Code of his right hon. friend this year prevailing all over the country. There never had been from the beginning in these schools any difficulty from the point of view either of the Church of Engand or any other denomination with reference to the religious instruction which was imparted. The hon. Baronet had said that they were by this new Code for the first time imposing religious disabilities in the training colleges. But on the contrary his right hon. friend was removing some of the religious disabilities under which Nonconformists had suffered for generations. The hon. Baronet said the Code had been got up to meet the clamour of a clique of Nonconformists. They did not mind hard words being used towards them, if only the diabilities from which they had suffered were removed, and to the extent that these disabilities were removed he most heartily approved of the provisions incorporated for the first time in the Code of Regulations under the *régime* of his right hon. friend. He would point out what the hon. Baronet called imposing religious disabilities. This was one of the regulations—

> "In no circumstances may the application of a candidate be rejected on the ground of religious faith or by reason of his refusal to undertake to attend or abstain from attending any place of religious worship or any religious observances or instruction in religious subjects in the college or elsewhere; nor on the ground of social antecedents or the like."

He should think that was an attempt to remove religious disabilities already existing. To say it was imposing religious disabilities was to use the phrase in a most unwarrantable fashion.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that what he meant by "religious disability" was that they took a particular sort of religious instruction which persons desired and said that if they had that religious instruction in their establishment they should not get the money which the State gave.

*MR. S. T. EVANS said he should call that freedom from any religious disability. I the hon. Baronet would refer to one other of the regulations he would see that after August 1st, 1907, no institution not already recognised as a training college or hostel would be so recognised unless certain conditions were observed. First, no catechism or formulary of any particular religious denomination might be taught in the college or hostel, "except in the case where the parent or guardian requested the governor in writing to provide that the student's religious instruction in the doctrines, catechism or formularies distinctive of any particular denomination." He did not know whether the hon. Baronet had forgotten that provision, or whether the Code had not been in his hands sufficiently long to enable him to master it. Why did the denominations assert an exclusive claim to the training colleges? Everybody knew that training colleges had been mainly built by public money, and that they had been maintained for generations almost exclusively by public money. Who had had the benefit of that? The Church of England had had the benefit, and that was the particular denomination that was fighting in this matter to retain the exclusive right to manage the institutions. It had excluded whenever it had thought fit anybody who would not submit to its regulations, doctrines, teachings, or religious observances in the colleges. It was in order to remove these disabilities and to enable Nonconformists to enter these State institutions without sacrificing their self-respect, and to adhere to the religious beliefs of themselves and their parents that he and his friends wanted the resolution to be adopted. If denominations desired to retain their colleges, let them keep them by all means—he would not even require them to disgorge any of the public money which had been spent on the colleges—but let them maintain those colleges at the exclusive expense of the denomination which they served. It had been complained that the present proposal was legislation by regulation. That might be so, but what had rendered that course necessary was the attitude of the Conservative Party in the House, and of their allies in another place. The Minister for Education had not only the right but it was his duty to do his best to give effect to the well-known wishes of the electorate when those wishes had been thwarted in the Upper House.

He hoped that the Minister for Education would continue in the course he had adopted. Let him not be frightened by the cry that he was doing wrong. There had been notable instances where reforms were achieved by Executive Act, where legislation had failed. There was the well-known historic proposal to abolish purchase in the Army. A Bill with that object passed the Commons but was rejected by the Lords. Mr. Gladstone then advised the Crown to abolish purchase in the Army by Royal Warrant. He was constitutionally right, and, although it was a bold thing to do, it was justified, having regard to the welfare of the nation. If his right hon. friend was doing nothing outside an Act of Parliament, he was doing nothing wrong. Within the provisions and the letter of the statute he certainly had the right, and it was his duty to the supporters of the Government in the House and in the country, to deal with this question, not only in the training colleges, but also, so far as he could, in the denominational schools. He wanted to know whether his right hon. friend could not go a little bit further in dealing with the voluntary schools by means of the Code. His right hon. friend ought, in his judgment, to give every support to the local authorities to insist upon the observance of all the statutory obligations which had been imposed upon the trustees and managers of the denominational schools. They would have no ground to complain, because the obligations were slight enough in all conscience, having regard to the advantages which they still retained and the control which they still wielded. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would insist upon these obligations being carried out to the very letter of the law. What were some of the obligations? The first was that the school buildings must be kept in repair by the trustees of the schools, and in many parts of the country it was said that the local authorities had been very strict upon the managers and the owners of the schools in this matter. He submitted that it was the duty of the Education Department to see to it that if the school was not kept in repair and the provisions under the Act of 1902 were not observed that the local authorities should be supported in their refusal to give any grant to the school. They had no access to the reports of the inspectors, but he made bold to say that in the pigeon-holes available to his right hon. friend he would find abundant evidence that many of the schools were not in proper repair and condition, and that Clause 7 of the Act was not observed, and that under the Act of Parliament they were no longer entitled to be public schools and have public money given to them. He urged this especially for the sake of the children. The next obligation was to make such reasonable alterations and improvements as might be required by the local authority: and he wished to refer to the alteration in the Code of the space or floor area required for every scholar which was a provision of great importance touching the health and comfort of the children. The prefatory note to the Code stated—

> "The Board, however, propose to take steps gradually to bring the accommodation up to the proper standard, and as a first step towards doing this they have removed from the Code the provision which has hitherto appeared stating that there shall in no case be less than eight square feet of internal area for each unit of the number of children in average attendance for which the school is recognised."

The inclusion of this provision had in certain cases been misinterpreted as implying that eight square feet was accepted by the Board as adequate, just as, when a speed of twenty miles was allowed in regard to motor cars, everyone thought that motors must go twenty miles an hour. In regard to new council schools he understood that the Board of Education in their building regulations required that they should show an average of not less than ten square feet of floor-space for each scholar in average attendance.

MR. MCKENNA said that applied to all new schools.

*MR. S. T. EVANS said that was a reasonable provision. But it was pointed out in the note to the Code that in voluntary schools erected in earlier years the accommodation had usually been calculated at eight square feet per scholar only, and as the Board were not always supplied with complete plans, it was stated that it was possible that in some cases the actual accommodation had not reached even this minimum standard. If the standard of ten feet was right in regard to council schools, he maintained that it would be a reasonable requirement on the part of the local education authority that the trustees and managers of voluntary schools should also make provision for this space, as a condition of the right of public maintenance. He also thought play-grounds ought to be attached to all schools, and that they should be made (as the Code provided) healthy, safe in case of fire, that there should be sufficient sanitary and cloak-room accommodation, and that they should be adequately lighted, warmed, ventilated, cleaned and drained, kept in proper repair, and should be sufficiently convenient and suitably arranged for the instruction of children: and no grant should be paid unless these provisions were complied with. Then again, the quality and quantity of the staffing in the voluntary schools should be brought up to the same level as in the council schools. They must come to this sooner or later, that the public must provide their own schools, and that there must be one, and only one, common type of elementary school erected and maintained by the State where all children would be treated on the same footing. Nobody could deny that the quality and quantity of staffing in the council schools was on a higher scale than in the denominational schools, and he wanted the level in the latter raised to that of the former. This might force the local authorities to do what they did not want to do; it might put people's backs up so as to make them passive resisters, but if it produced the reforms they desired, it would be worth the sacrifice. With regard to the grants, there were, as he understood, five different grants given to elementary schools. There was the Aid Grant given under Section 10 of the 1902 Act, which must be given by Statute, and which the Department could not withhold if the school fulfilled the conditions. Then there was the Fee Grant, which was also statutory; but next came the Annual Grant, which was 17s. per head to infants, and 22s. per head for older children, which was in a different category. Was it not possible for the right hon. Gentleman to say that he would not continue to give these latter grants in respect of any schools unless the owners gave the majority of the control to the public and unless they made the regulations of the schools similar to those which would now prevail in the training colleges? The only argument against the Department having that power appeared in Section 97 of the Act of 1870, which provided that advantage should not be given to one school over another. But this was not a question of giving a bigger grant to one school and a smaller to another. The Act of 1870 did not say the right hon. Gentleman could not impose conditions as to the grant, and he therefore submitted that the Department was in a like position *qua* this particular annual grant with regard to the elementary schools as with the training colleges. He trusted his right hon. friend would consider that matter. Finally, he congratulated him for having boldly faced the situation. It came with a very bad grace from hon. Members opposite to say that his right hon. friend had no right by this method, and by means of the Code, to try and mitigate the injustice from which the people had suffered so long. If it had not been for the treatment which the Education Bill of last year received at the hands of the other House, these regulations would never have been made. What had happened last year completely justified them. He could assure his right hon. friend that if he went fast and boldly in the direction he had indicated, he would have the consistent and unanimous support of all those who sat on the Ministerial side of the House.

*MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) said the hon. and learned Gentleman who had just spoken was nothing if not humorous, and sometimes he was an unconscious humorist. During the debates of 1902 the hon. and learned Gentleman was constantly expressing distrust of the Education Office as an executive Department. He must have some humorous recollections now of how he forgot in that day that what one executive embarked upon with levity, a later executive might possibly reverse with wisdom and with popular acceptance. These considerations were only some among many evidences that the day had gone by when in respect of Radical measures either of legislation or of executive power, men could say "they are bound to come, and, having come, are bound to remain." Bad legislation could now be and probably would be reversed and set aside. And he could promise hon. Gentlemen opposite that no efforts would be lacking—and probably a considerable deal of success would attend those efforts—to obtain popular approval for the complete reversal of these flagitious measures of the present Executive. There was a recent example which might serve as a warning to the President of the Board of Education. The right hon. Gentleman was being invited to embark on an executive crusade against voluntary schools. In 1893–5 they had such an executive crusade, and then there was the general election of 1895. Some of the acuter observers of the contests of that period were of opinion that although perhaps cordite had something to do with it, and Home Rule had something more to do with it, and possibly beer had something to do with it, yet the crusade of those days undertaken by Mr. Arthur Acland against the Church schools probably had more than anything else to do with the dire reverse which befell the Liberal Party of that day. [AN HON. MEMBER: That is unconscious humour.] When invitations to proceed upon a crusade of that kind were addressed to the right hon. Gentleman—when he was asked to renew in 1907 what had such dire consequences in 1895—he (Mr. Stuart Wortley) and many of his friends hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would try.

MR. HARVEY (Rochdale) remarked that according to the doctrine laid down by the last speaker a Liberal Government was to carry out the regulations and arrangements of its Tory predecessors and then there would be peace, but immediately a Liberal Government dared to put into operation those principles of administration which its Members were elected to carry out, the direst consequences were threatened. He did not think the Liberal Party would assent to a propostion of that sort. His purpose was to offer a few criticisms upon what he considered to be the apathy of the Board of Education with regard to the defective condition of many of the elementary schools. The situation, he thought, was one which demanded courage and determination on the part of the Board. His view was that the rejection of the Bill of last year, so far from paralysing the Board, ought to stimulate them to a relentless performance of their obvious duties. After the rejection of the generous and just measure of last year many of them had predicted that a course of strong administration would immediately be set on foot. Something had been said about a bloodless administration. He never understood the meaning of those words, but he hoped they did not mean that the administration might be colourless and anæmic. He had always thought that many of our educational difficulties might be set straight by administration. He did not ask for vindictive action, which would be undignified and tend to set up a feeling of sympathy where sympathy was not merited. It was common knowledge that many elementary schools were bad in the sense that they were bad for the health of children and teachers, and the results obtained, moreover, were not commensurate with the public money spent on them. The Board of Education compelled the children to go to these schools and was bound to safeguard the children's interests. He urged that the Board should stand behind the local authorities in these matters and give them its support. Incidentally he might say that he admitted the Act of 1902 had had the effect of improving elementary education by the raising of the salaries of the teachers and by stimulating public interest in education. He maintained that playgrounds, cloakrooms, and lavatories were required for all elementary schools, and he thought the time had come when the 10-feet space area should be insisted upon. If the President of the Board of Education could not follow the children to their homes, at all events he could insist that in the schools there should be a sufficiency of light and air during the hours which they spent there. The right hon. Gentleman could not see that the children went early to bed, but he could set his face against the nerve-destroying conditions of many schools where the conflict of raised voices interfered with the processes of education and rendered the children irritable and confused. The Board acted not only by codes and regulations, but through inspectors who were always willing to do their duty. When the last Education Bill was carried the then President of the Board, Lord Londonderry, called the inspectors together conspicuously and publicly, and told them to stay their hands and not to report adversely against bad schools. The President of the Board should follow that example publicly and conspicuously, but with this difference. Let him call together the inspectors in the public eye, and tell them that he would like to hear of all those cases; let him insist, in fact, upon a survey of the schools of the country, and let the results of that survey be made publicly known. The Blue-book published each year giving a list of the elementary schools of the country was supposed to contain figures of the accommodation in each school with the number of children the managers were entitled to teach therein. Those figures were very inaccurate. In many cases they very much overstated the capacity of the school. He had instances in his mind. He would not be expected to give the names of the schools, but he could hand them to the right hon. Gentleman. He was very well acquainted with a certain denominational school which had a mixed department that, according to the Blue-book, accommodated 561 children. On the 8-feet basis it could only accommodate 524, and on the 10-feet basis 401; and the working accommodation of the school was assessed by the managers at 394. That deceived the public. He came to the case of six schools in Lancashire, where the Blue-book gave the accommodation in the mixed department at 1,310, but which on the 8 feet basis was only 1,180, and where the working accommodation, as assessed by the officials of the Lancashire County Council, was for 898, the full number of children that could be taught. He thought the President of the Board of Education would act wisely if he resurveyed those schools, because they wanted the public to know the true facts of the situation, for until they did know the true facts they would never make the progress which so many of them desired. Many cases must be known to Members of the House where inspectors had reported adversely upon schools, and yet those reports had mysteriously disappeared, and they knew nothing more about them. He made these criticisms in no hostile spirit, for he believed the Minister for Education was showing great energy this year, but he wanted to assure him of the support he would receive if he proved still more energetic.

Mr. BOLAND (Kerry, S.) said he did not know whether the President of the Board of Education was aware of the effect produced among the Catholics of this country by the publication of the regulations for secondary schools and training colleges. He could assure him that they were regarded as a declaration of war, and he would, before he sat down, move the reduction of the Vote in order to emphasise their attitude upon this subject. He thought the least that could be said was that the President of the Board of Education had endeavoured to pass, by regulations for secondary schools, what the Government last year failed to obtain in the case of elementary schools. The endeavour was undoubtedly to starve out the denominational schools in the case of the secondary schools, to interfere with the training colleges, Catholic and Protestant, and then by easy stages, having secured the principle in the case of secondary schools and training colleges, to proceed, at as early a date as possible, to the absolute destruction of the denominational colleges and schools of the country. He spoke only with a knowledge of the Catholic training colleges, which to a great extent had been built by Catholics out of their own funds. He found from the regulations dealing with training colleges, that application might be made for and on behalf of any candidate who had been refused admission to a college, with a view to obtaining the Board's decision as to whether Section 8 had been infringed. By this the door was immediately opened to outside influences, quite apart from the actual student who was supposed to be interfered with. Then the regulation went on—

> "If the grounds on which the candidate has been rejected are in the view of the Board

> unreasonable, the college or hostel returned will be liable to a reduction in its total grant for the year, not exceeding £100, on the first occasion, and to removal from the list of recognised colleges or hostels on the second occasion."

The importance of this would be seen if they took one of the Catholic training colleges where at the present moment there was not a single student who was not Catholic. What was to prevent someone who was not a Catholic presenting himself as a candidate and being refused, in which event £100 would be deducted from the grant? And, again, what was to prevent a strong Nonconformist parent, anxious to do away with the Catholic training college in his district, from getting his son to present himself as a candidate and being refused, in which event the college would be removed altogether from the list of colleges and hostels receiving grants. He did not think it was the least exaggeration to say that this could be done under the actual terms of the regulations. They might foresee the spirit in which these regulations would be carried out from the speech made by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Mid. Glamorgan, but the Catholics were prepared to meet this declaration of war, if a declaration of war was meant, by the strongest refusal and objection to seeing these regulations put in force. It would be equally possible for him to detain the House with reference to the regulations for secondary schools if he desired to do so; but he thought that he was justified in saying that they went *pari passu* with the regulations for training colleges. The two things stood together, coupled with this fact, that these regulations were to come into force on 1st August. They had only received four weeks notice. He did not know whether they could be issued at any moment or had to lie on the Table for four or five weeks. ["No."] If they were not to be laid on the Table, then there was all the more reason that they should not be sprung on the country. If these regulations could be issued two or three weeks before they came into force, there was nothing whatever to prevent the Board of Education from issuing them the day before they were to come into operation. It had always been considered that a certain amount of time should be given to Members and the public generally to consider regulations by the documents being laid on the Table for a specified period, and he contended that where that was not done Members of that House and the public should have due and solemn notice before such absolutely revolutionary regulations were brought into force. The hon. and learned Member for Mid. Glamorgan had referred to the necessity of the Government stiffening their backs and supporting the local education authorities. He would like to mention two instances which showed the way in which, if that advice were adopted, denominational schools, Catholic and Protestant, throughout the country would have absolutely no chance of being heard or getting justice. One case occurred in the West Riding of Yorkshire which he believed was coming before the right hon. Gentleman personally for decision. It was that of a school at Mortomley, near Sheffield. The salaries of the teachers had been withheld since 1st May on the objection taken by the local authority that the playground had not been asphalted. The only answer he wished to make on this case was to quote from letters sent by the Board of Education itself to the local education authority in this particular matter. On the 17th May, in the present year, the Board of Education wrote to the local education authority as follows—

> "The Board have been informed by the managers that the authority have required them to asphalt the playground as a condition of maintaining the school. I am to remind you that, in the opinion of the Board, the authority are not empowered to make such a requirement, though the managers are under an obligation to put and maintain the playground in a proper condition for the use for which it was intended. In the present case the Board understand that the managers have given an undertaking to carry out their duties in this respect."

That was the reply given officially by the Board of Education to the local education authority, and that authority refused to accept that decision. They refused to pay the salaries of the teachers and for three months they had been kept without salaries. A little later, on the 8th June, another letter was written by the Board of Education to the local education authority in the following terms—

> "Under these circumstances there appears to be no reason why the authority should not recognise the new premises and continue to maintain the school as required by Section 7 of the Education Act of 1902."

That was a case in which the local education authority received two answers from the Board of Education directing them to maintain this particular school, and yet they refused to pay the salaries necessary to do so. He referred to the case as showing what the local education authority was able to do if it had within its ranks people determined to destroy the educational character of a school. The second case was more important, because it raised in a remarkable degree the action, not only of the Board of Education, but also of the local education authority, which was the county council for the West Riding of Yorkshire. It was the case of the Low Valley schools, and it exemplified what could be done by a local education authority when the Board of Education was dilatory in carrying out the Act of 1902. Public notice was given on 19th January, 1906, under Section 8 of the Act of the intention of the promoters to provide a new school. The Act provided that there should be no unnecessary delay in carrying out the requirements, but in this case six clear months elapsed before a public inquiry was held. It was held on 4th July, and the inspector actually issued his report on 30th July last year. Would the House believe it, it was not until nine months after that report was sent in that the Board of Education gave its decision, and all that time this particular school was being maintained by the people of the district out of their own pockets. During those fifteen months the Board of Education, by its dilatoriness, prevented the matter being settled. Meanwhile the anxiety of the local authority was undoubtedly to have this Low Valley Catholic school crushed out as well as the neighbouring Church of England school, and, towards the end of 1905, they gave notice that they wanted a new school built to accommodate 720 scholars, which practically meant that the Church of England and the Catholic schools would be closed and their scholars find their way into the new council school. But that school had not yet been built; the council had not even got a site, and if they got permission to build to-morrow it would be at least a year before it could be erected. Meanwhile the local education authority had acquired possession of what was previously a Wesleyan school which they were now carrying on as a provided school. That school was admitted to be the most unsatisfactory building of all school buildings in the district. The council were still maintaining that school, and no conclusion had yet been arrived at to obtain a site for the new school. By the action of the local education authority and the Board of Education in neglecting to bring matters to a head the Catholic miners of Barnsley had had for two years to maintain the Low Valley school out of their own slender resources, and last Monday the Church of England school was closed. Whether the parents of that school would join with the Catholics in maintaining their own school remained to be seen, but he hoped they would and so check this direct effort of the local education authority of the West Riding to crush out denominational schools. He submitted that if any hon. Member would read the correspondence which had been printed and published with respect to the Low Valley school, he would see what would happen if the Board of Education did not stand fairly between parents who desired denominational education and a local education authority determined at all costs to act in an unfortunate spirit which had not characterised English local government administration. He hoped they would see that the Board of Education acted honestly as a court of appeal and not delay when it meant help to the local authority, and above all that it would check that unfortunate spirit which seemed to be spreading on the West Riding County Council and was trying to crush out denominational schools altogether. The regulations for training colleges and secondary schools were a direct declaration of war on the part of the Board of Education, and they would undoubtedly be accepted by the Catholics and Protestants of Great Britain in that light. The Board of Education had not acted fairly in bringing forward those regulations only a few days before they had to come into force, and only a couple of days before this important debate. He begged to move a reduction of the Vote by £100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (1) (Salaries, Wages, and Allowances) be reduced by £100."—(*Mr. Boland.*)

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) said that the hon. Member for South Kerry had so well stated the case of the particular schools about which complaint was made that there was really no need for him to refer again to those specific cases. He would like, however, to make one or two general remarks on the regulations which had been issued by the Board of Education. Whether the Minister for Education realised it or not, he was certainly by these proposals preparing the way for a great deal of trouble for himself and his Party. If he imagined that he could treat minorities in this way he was making a very great mistake indeed. He entirely denied the right of any Government, no matter how strong, to spring upon the country and Parliament regulations which meant an absolute revolution in the management of the schools of the land. These regulations, if carried into effect, would entirely change the whole management of secondary schools and training colleges. That being so, the very least they expected was that full and ample notice would have been given by the Government of their intention. It was altogether wrong that it should be within the power of any administration, simply by the publication of a couple of pamphlets, to introduce such extraordinary and fundamental changes. Last year the Government endeavoured frankly and in the ordinary way by introducing a Bill to crush, to a great extent, many of the denominational schools in the country. Whatever might be said for a course of that kind, there was absolutely nothing to be said for either the candour or the courage of a Government which endeavoured to crush denominational institutions, not by introducing a Bill, but by issuing a couple of pamphlets without any notice whatever. They often heard that it was more and more becoming the practice of Parliament to be asked to register the will of the Cabinet and that it was really at the Cabinet Councils that the programme of the Government was settled and not by discussions in Parliament. However that might be, it was not for the present Cabinet, no matter how large a majority might be behind it, to carry through without notice, by regulations, or by Act of Parliament, changes which very injuriously affected large minorities in the country. There was no need for him to go at length into the changes involved by the new regulations. Any man who read the pamphlets would come at once to the conclusion that they had but one intention, and that was mercilessly to crush denominational schools and training colleges. With reference to admission to training colleges, there was an extraordinary change. They were told that—

> "In no circumstances may the application of a candidate be rejected on the ground of religious faith or by reason of his refusal to undertake to attend or abstain from attending any place of religious worship, or any religious observance, or instruction in religious subjects in the college or elsewhere."

[Cheers.] Yes, that was cheered by hon. Gentlemen opposite. It might suit the schools and the class of establishments of which they approved very well, but could a more monstrous regulation be laid down with reference to a Catholic boarding school which was in existence simply because it was a Catholic school, and to which parents sent their children mainly, and almost entirely, because they knew that there, at any rate, they would be taught the religion they themselves believed and which they desired their children to be taught? What did it mean? It meant that if these schools were to continue to get any grants-in-aid whatever, under these regulations, they would have to give up their character as denominational schools altogether.

MR. MCKENNA: No.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said the right hon. Gentleman denied that, and no doubt he would endeavour later on to justify his denial. But, after all, what they had to consider on these matters was the opinion of the people who were affected by them, and he said that the Catholic people of this country, at any rate, whatever might be said for the Protestant denominations, would read these regulations as having one object, and that was to destroy the Catholic character of their schools which had been established with very great difficulty and with much sacrifice. With regard to the regulations for the training colleges, they put a premium upon attempts by people who were bitterly hostile to the Catholic religion at any rate, to enter the training colleges simply for the purpose of breaking them up altogether. What was to prevent students claiming admission to any of the Catholic training colleges in the country, and, if the conditions set forth in the new regulations were not carried out, the training colleges being closed altogether? The regulations in reference to the training schools and colleges were most unjust and, at the very least, full warning ought to have been given by the right hon. Gentleman before the changes were made. He did not know whether the President of the Board of Education expected that the people who bitterly resisted the attempt made by the Education Bill of last year to crush the denominational schools were going calmly to submit to its being done by regulations. If they resisted being wiped out by Act of Parliament, they would still more resist being interfered with or wiped out by regulations. The protest made during that debate was but the commencement of a protest which would not be confined to the House of Commons. It would spread through every part of the country, and in the end the Government would be convinced that it was not possible at this time in the history of the world to proceed in the manner proposed in these regulations. The time had come when, in matters of the deepest and most vital interest in connection with the education of children, the country ought not to be asked to consent to regulations drawn up in the Education Department or any other Department. If these changes were to be made in reference to training colleges and schools, let a Bill be introduced into Parliament, with full warning of its introduction, so that the people had an opportunity of making their opinions known and felt, and let not this cowardly attempt be made to do an underhand sort of a way what the Government did not succeed in doing when it was proposed by the Bill of last year. He felt that he had spoken somewhat strongly in the matter, but he assured hon. Gentlemen opposite that his indignation had been aroused by the sudden publication of these regulations. Speaking quite frankly and without any hostile spirit at all, he did not know what had come over the counsels of the present Government. For some time past they had been wasting time, in many directions. They had been taking step after step which had not led them a bit more forward in the confidence of the people or strengthened their position in this House. Practically at the end of the session these changes were suggested. He could only say that of the many mistakes that had been made this would probably, if persisted in, be found to be the greatest, and it would prove a colossal blunder so far as the interest of the Government was concerned. He was afraid that unless some strong assurance was given by the right hon. Gentleman to calm the fears that had been aroused, these proposals would give rise to more trouble in the country and in Parliament than the right hon. Gentleman had any idea of.

MR. MCKENNA said the hon. Baronet who moved the reduction of the Vote, and also the hon. Member for East Clare, had complained that the training college regulations had been sprung upon the people without notice. Upon that preliminary point he had two answers to make. On 15th May this year in the House of Commons he said—

> "With regard to the training colleges, he had found that question a difficult one to deal with. The only conclusion he had been able to come to was that in every training college there ought to be a conscience clause. The training colleges were almost exclusively supported out of public funds. That regulation would, for administrative reasons, not come into force this year, but it would come before the House next year."

That was the exact position. This regulation would come into force next year.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): When were these regulations published?

MR. MCKENNA said they were published three days ago. His meaning was perfectly understood on 15th May by the hon. Baronet the Member for Oxford University, who said—

> "As regarded the training colleges, the effect of what had been told them by the President of the Board of Education was not at first sight very obvious, but at the same time it did not strike him as being very alarming to those colleges which had been built and started by denominations."

Then he went on to say, showing that he thoroughly appreciated the meaning of the conscience clause—

> "The requirements of the proposed conscience clause did not seem to him to amount to more than this, that a Nonconformist would be able to go to a Church college, and that a Church of England student would be able to go to a Noncomformist college, both without any fear of proselytising."

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: But I did not understand from you that Nonconformists would be forced upon either Church of England or Roman Catholic colleges, and I said I reserved my opinion upon the regulations until I saw them.

MR. MCKENNA said all he had done was to make that conscience clause of which he then gave notice a reality. He would have been misleading the House if he had only done what the hon. Baronet suggested. If he had merely said that the managers of training colleges might accept a Nonconformist if they liked, or that they might accept a Church of England applicant at the bottom of the list instead of a Nonconformist at the top, he would have been deceiving the House. He had done exactly what he had said he would do. The hon. Member for South Kerry had called this "a declaration of war." He would be sorry if anything he had done in this regulation were regarded as in the nature of a declaration of war. It was not so intended, and he did not think it would be found so in operation. What he meant to do was to throw these schools and colleges open to applicants of all denominations so long as the schools and colleges were maintained out of public moneys. If these denominational colleges were maintained by private funds he would naturally have nothing to say. They would not be under his control. But so long as the public paid, the public ought to control. If there was one thing on which the public clearly expressed their desire at the last election it was that in schools and colleges there might be public control over public expenditure. The hon. Member for Clare had said that he had taken a new line, and he referred to paragraph 18 of the new regulations. If the hon. Member, however, would turn to the Act of 1902—an Act which he supported—he would find religious instruction upon the very lines laid down in these regulations with regard to secondary schools. He was only following the principle laid down in, and using the language of, that Bill.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that if the right hon. Gentleman would read the clause he would find that the local authority was expressly forbidden, either to require or not to require that religious instruction should or should not be given.

MR. MCKENNA said the hon. Baronet had stated better than he could his point, which was that as regarded the rates it was expressly provided that the local authority should not have regard to religion. He was following out that principle in regard to training colleges. He was making it a condition in regard to training colleges, to which a grant was paid, that no person should be excluded because he practised or abstained from practising any particular religion. It was the same principle, though the application was not the same. Freedom from denominational qualification was a condition of receiving public aid.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said it was somewhat irritating continually to hear the statement "public money." Did not the denominations pay their full share of public money and were they not entitled to consideration?

MR. MCKENNA said he would deal with the general principle in a moment. The hon. Baronet had challenged him on Clause 4. Paragraph (a) of Subsection (2) provided that—

> "A scholar attending as a day or evening scholar shall not be required, as a condition of being admitted into or remaining in the school or college, to attend or abstain from attending any Sunday school, place of religious worship, religious observance, or instruction in religious subjects in the school or college or elsewhere."

He had applied the same principle to training colleges. There were two other particular points, before he dealt with the general question, which the hon. Member for South Kerry had referred to—the conduct of the local education authority in the West Riding of Yorkshire in regard to schools at Mortomley and Low Valley. The case of Mortomley, as the hon. Member was aware, was *sub judice.* He had the case before him, and it would not be proper for him to say anything upon it at the present moment. With regard to Low Valley, the difficulty arose originally with regard to the Catholic school and the building of a council school. When the proper statutory notice under the Act of 1902 to build the council school was given, no opposition was taken by the representatives of the Catholics. Consequently, the local education authority obtained leave to build the school in the absence of any opposition. As no opposition was taken, it could not be assumed that the parents in the district did not require a council school, but wished, on the contrary, to have a Roman Catholic or Church school. Having obtained the right, the local education authority, he understood, intended to build the school, but had been prevented by local difficulties with regard to the transfer of the site from doing so up to the present time. They were within their statutory rights, and, though the hon. Member might complain of the action of the local education authority, he did not see that he had any ground of complaint against the Board. It was true he had spoken of the delay between July last year until the early part of this year, but, as he knew, in many cases very important questions of dispute between local education authorities and managers of schools arose owing to the fact that a Bill was then before Parliament, although in the present case the delay seemed to have operated disadvantageously, as the hon. Member thought, to the school managers. There were many instances where it had operated disadvantageously to the local education authorities. He would pass from that to the question raised originally by the Leader of the Opposition in regard to the proposal to put upon the Estimates the charge for £100,000 for building new schools. The right hon. Gentleman had very truly said that the proposal was a contradiction of a clause in the Act of 1870. So far, they were on common ground. He went on to say, however, that it was unconstitutional or at any rate improper and possibly disorderly to make any such proposal in the Estimates until the clause in the Act of 1870 had been repealed. He observed that it would be a very difficult position for the courts to deal with, if they found, at one and the same time, two Acts of Parliament, one forbidding the building of schools out of public money and the other, the Appropriation Act, apparently authorising the building of such schools out of money granted from the Exchequer. That, he took it, was the position the right hon. Gentleman took up. The answer was really very much simpler than he had suggested could be the case. It was perfectly true the Act of 1870 forbade the application of Exchequer grants to the purposes of building schools, but it did not bind Parliament for all time, and it was perfectly open to the House, first by Vote and secondly by the incorporation of that Vote in the Appropriation Act, provided the purpose was explicitly stated in the Appropriation Act—perfectly possible and proper he submitted—to override to the extent that the Appropriation Act could override an Act of Parliament by the inclusion of a particular charge in the Appropriation Act. He said the extent to which the Appropriation Act could override it, because the Appropriation Act did not repeal or purport to repeal the Act of 1870. The prohibition under the Act of 1870 continued. The Appropriation Act only lasted during the currency of the present financial year. All he could do under the Appropriation Act and all he would do if Parliament allowed him would be to acquire the right to pay out of money voted by the House a sum of £100,000 for the purpose of building schools up to 31st March next. If he had not spent all the money then he must surrender what remained to the Exchequer in accordance with the usual practice. He could not carry the money over, and could not go on spending any part of the money after 31st March. The Act of 1870 still remained in force, and the prohibition still existed, but so far as the Appropriation Act had authorised the expenditure of this £100,000 within the year only he would be able to spend that money under the authority of statute. He did not know whether any question of order would ever be submitted. He could not see that one arose. The right hon. Gentleman might not like it, and he might have his own view as to the constitutional point, but he could hardly put a point of order for the Chair. The right hon. Gentleman raised the question of the refusal of hostel grants under the regulations either for new denominational hostels built in connection with undenominational training colleges or undenominational hostels built in connection with denominational training colleges, but he did not quite state the whole meaning and purport of the grants. It was perfectly true that what were known as hostel grants would no longer be given in respect of hostels under the conditions which he had described, but there was nothing to prevent an ordinary student getting a lodging grant and taking it where he liked. The difference between the hostel and lodging grants was a matter of £10 a year. The lodging grant was in respect to the expense of a student's living whilst training for the profession of a teacher, and the hostel grant was an additional grant to cover the expense of the corporate life which the student lived in a hostel. The question he had to consider was, ought they to pay that what one might call the corporate grant when the corporate body was held together for a denominational purpose? If it was for a denominational purpose that the hostel was maintained, ought not that corporate body to provide for the hostel? They gave the lodging grant presumably for what it cost to keep the student who attended daily a training college, but if he wished to live in the denominational atmosphere of the hostel, then the denominations ought to pay for that atmosphere. The student might take his lodging grant where he pleased. The Board had no desire to prevent anybody living in a denominational atmosphere if he or she wished. All they had sought to do was not to make the public pay for that atmosphere. Freedom to the student was still fully granted. A question had been raised by the right hon. Gentleman as to the building grants, but it had been cleared up in the course of the discussion by the hon. Baronet, and therefore he need not further refer to the matter. The hon. Baronet had made a strong and plausible constitutional point in respect of the regulations. He had said that the regulations should not be used for enforcing or preventing religious doctrine from being taught, but that if Parliament wished to enforce such teaching or abstention it ought to be carried out by an Act. That was a very pleasing doctrine in the mouth of the hon. Baronet. When the hon. Baronet had a majority in the House he had also a majority elsewhere; and when he pointed to what he did in 1902 and held the action up as a model for the Government to follow, the hon. Baronet was really holding up something which the Government could not copy. He would be willing to introduce a Bill as the Chief Secretary did if it were in his power to do all that the hon. Baronet wished; but he could not—not because of the House of Commons, for the representatives of the people would give him an overwhelming authority; and he was asking them to give this authority by the regulations.

SIR W. ANSON: Does the right hon. Gentleman not remember that the Cowper-Temple Clause was introduced by a Liberal Government?

MR. McKENNA said he remembered perfectly that it was introduced by a Churchman, but he did not see how that fact was relevant to the present position. Whatever might have been done in 1870 could not be nearly so well done to-day, because the action of the other House last year had taught the Government that no matter what compromise they offered, they could not give force to the will of the majority of the House of Commons—he said it without offence—if the Leader of the Opposition thought it to be more advantageous to his Party that the Bill should not pass. Under these conditions, he was forced to take the only method open to him, a perfectly proper method, perfectly constitutional, thoroughly authorised by statute, and to enforce these principles by means of a regulation. All that he could do by regulations was to make the doing of a particular act or the refraining from doing a particular act a condition of money grant. But he could not declare by regulation this or that thing illegal; all he could do was to say that he could only distribute these grants in accordance with certain conditions, and in that he was acting in a perfectly constitutional way. After all, it was a pure money question, and although he admitted that a Bill would give a fuller opportunity of debate, nevertheless, inasmuch as a Bill would have no prospect of passing, he was bound to take the only course open to him and to make these necessary changes by regulations. Then the hon. Baronet had complained of the secondary school regulations for local education authority control; but he reminded the hon. Member that there had been ample time for him to consider them and their effect since May 15, when the policy was welcomed, though the giving of the local authority a majority was deprecated. To-day the hon. Baronet assumed a different position, though between 15th May and now he had not received a word of protest from the hon. Baronet on the point. [Sir W. ANSON: There has been no opportunity.] The hon. baronet had enjoyed several opportunities, and, considering that he was interested in education, it would not have been beyond precedent had the hon. Baronet made a private representation to him on the subject. He submitted, therefore, that he was not being treated quite fairly in this matter. The hon. Member for Mid. Glamorgan had suggested that by administration as to buildings the Board could do a very great deal in the event of default to enforce the condition of a certain type of school throughout the country, and the hon. Member had asked whether the Department would support a local authority in its efforts to secure that the managers of voluntary schools should maintain their buildings in the condition prescribed by statute. On that point he replied with a most whole-hearted affirmative. In no case that he knew of had the Board ever refused to support the local education authority where the Board was asked to assist it in carrying out the law. There was no doubt that the Board had consistently endeavoured to enforce the conditions of the law, and it would endeavour to do so. Then as to the ten square feet of floor space for each child in attendance, and the exercise of a power, in case of default, to compel managers to close the schools, he had not this power over the local authorities. All that he could do was to say to the managers that they must turn out a certain number of the children so that the remaining children would be provided for on the basis of ten feet square floor space. But he had no power to make managers alter their buildings if the buildings were otherwise suitable. The Department could not say that the managers must build in order to find accommodation, and if they were to say that all the excess number of children were to be turned out of every school in which the floor space was less than ten feet square per child, there would be hundreds of thousands of children turned into the streets. The necessary school accommodation over the whole country could not be provided under two to three years, and this arbitrary act compelling schools to be built would be regarded by the local education authority as so unfair upon them, and so disliked by the electors, that, whatever the desire of the Government might be, the resistance to the Government would be so great that no Government would ever enforce the law.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR thought it would be found that Parliament had placed it in the power of the Department to compel local authorities.

MR. McKENNA said the Government had power in their hands to force a local authority to do a particular thing, but when that took a great deal of time and cost a great deal of money—as the Government of the right hon. Gentleman found—the Government were very cautious how they proceeded. He did not for a moment dissent from that view. He realised, and the House realised, that they had made the local education authority responsible for the administration of the Education Act; and, unless there was a very strong case, he did not think they would be well advised in interfering unnecessarily with their discretion. The great local education authorities ought to be respected and had to be respected. They represented, in the case of London, some millions of people, and it would be a very difficult task to endeavour to coerce them into spending, suddenly and at once, perhaps a million of money in providing accommodation for children who would be turned out of school if the ten square feet rule were at once ordered to be adopted in every case. But by what they had done in this year's Code, they had taken the first step towards enforcing that rule, and they meant to put pressure upon every local authority to bring their school buildings up to the standard—he did not mean directly—that after a given date, say six months, this extra accommodation should be provided by all local authorities for all children; they had taken the first step to enforce the rule. They should do so with discretion and should have regard to the great burdens on the local ratepayers, because they recognised the great difficulties under which the local authorities acted in persuading the electors to consent to pay the education rate. Then he was asked whether he could not enforce Section 18 of the Code, where the majority of the managers were not representative of the local education authority, by refusing the annual grant. He did not think he could do that. He would be acting illegally if he did so. The managers in the case of the voluntary schools were appointed under statute, and he would be acting in contradiction of the spirit and letter of the statute if by any action through the Code he endeavoured to override the Act and compel the trustees to submit to the majority of the managers being appointed by the local education authority. He was invited by the hon. Member for Rochdale to take his courage in both hands and to insist upon closing schools if the condition of the buildings was not satisfactory. He made no concealment of his policy in this matter. He endeavoured in every case and by every means in his power to ensure that the buildings should be brought into a satisfactory condition. That he believed was the only possible policy, but he did not go the length of refusing a grant to the school. If the local authority asked him to have patience and assured him that they had reason to hope that the condition of the schools which the local authority would build in course of time would be satisfactory, he must have patience. If he failed to have patience, the only effect would be that the local education authority would refuse to build at all. No doubt he could proceed by mandamus against the local authority, but in the first place that would, if resisted, take a very considerable time to obtain, and when he had got it he would have to begin to build the school, and, in the meantime, for a period of some years, the whole educational condition of the town would be one of chaos. He was not prepared to take that course. He was bound to proceed with a view to the interests and the welfare of the children. He could not agree to act in that drastic way, which would only end in turning the children out into the street. He had to co-operate with the local education authority.

MR. HARVEY asked the right hon. Gentleman what he would do in the case of a school which had been absolutely condemned by the local inspector four years ago and nothing had been attempted to be done.

MR. MCKENNA said it was always easy to act in gross cases, and that in such a case he should have no hesitation in acting on the view of his hon. friend. But the case he was dealing with was a different one. He was asked, deliberately, by administrative act, to close a voluntary school in every case in which it did not come up to the full requirements of the Act of Parliament. He submitted that, however desirable it might be in the interests of the children that it should be brought up to the full standard required, they were bound in the interests of the children to proceed slowly. At the same time, he assured his hon. friend that he exercised all the pressure he could on the local education authorities to induce them to bring their schools up to the standard. A survey was now being made of all the schools. He had no further questions before him to answer, but he would have another opportunity to reply to others that might be put to him. In conclusion, he assured hon. gentlemen opposite that his regulation had not been framed in any spirit of hostility or warfare to them; and he could also assure his friends behind him that he was endeavouring to the utmost of his power, through the local education authorities, to secure full conformity with the rules.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he had already spoken and he only rose for the purpose of discussing shortly two or three points raised by the right hon. Gentleman in the series of replies which he had made to criticisms which had been passed, and he wished to ask whether those replies were to be taken as his statement of the education policy of the Government. If so, he ventured to think that it was much more meagre than his predecessors in office had been accustomed to give to the House. The right hon. Gentleman had not given them any satisfactory account of the substantive policy of the Government; he had simply contented himself with dealing with some of the comments on his policy. He could not understand why the right hon. Gentleman had not made a statement of his policy like his predecessors, unless it was that he was not prepared, and *ex hypothesi* had not the materials for it. After the replies which they had heard, did the right hon. Gentleman intend to make another statement? It was a new view of Parliamentary procedure that the circulation by a Minister of a small printed statement of the lines which he intended to pursue should be regarded as a complete and satisfactory substitute for the usual Parliamentary discussion in Committee, with the Minister in charge. If the right hon. Gentleman thought that the new departure was a good departure, then, after all, it was for him and the majority to decide whether that new departure should be adopted.

MR. MCKENNA said his impression was that the practice which the right hon. Gentleman called a new departure was followed by all the Departments, with the exception of the War Office and the Admiralty, which had several days for the consideration of their Estimates. All the others had but one day, and therefore they adopted this practice in order not to take up the time of the House.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR did not think the statement of the right hon. Gentleman was accurate in regard to other Departments; but certainly it was quite inaccurate in regard to the Education Department. However, he did not wish to pursue the point, and it was a matter which the right hon. Gentleman could settle between himself and the majority. He came now to the reply which the right hon. Gentleman had made, and in the first place he wished to congratulate him on the excellent and sound doctrine which he had laid down as to the amicable relations which should exist between the Board of Education and the local authorites. But he doubted whether the colleagues of the right hon. Gentleman would agree with that doctrine. Before he made his statement had the right hon. Gentleman consulted with the Minister in charge of the English Agricultural Holdings Bill? That Bill, by the avowal of the Minister who had drawn it up, was intended to coerce local authorities which did not carry out the policy which the Bill contained. That was the essence of the Agricultural Holdings Bill. ["No."] He thought the matter was put accurately in more sporting phraseology by the Under-Secretary for the Colonies that "ginger" was to be applied to them. In regard to the question of training colleges and hostels, what was the defence? The right hon. Gentleman was laying down regulations which might and very likely would convert a training college which was created by denominational funds, into an institution the whole denominational character of which would be destroyed by the fact that those who belonged to the denomination would be excluded from it, and those who differed from that denomination would be included. That was the policy which the right hon. Gentleman was deliberately pursuing. It was an unjust policy, and one which it was impossible to defend on principles of justice or religious toleration, and he did not believe that the right hon. Gentleman would find it possible consistently to carry it out. Then the right hon. Gentleman had gone on to tell them that if they allowed denominational hostels they were practically giving public funds to denominational purposes. Had the right hon. Gentleman forgotten the policy clearly laid down by his predecessor in office, the present Chief Secretary for Ireland, who had left the office of President of the Board of Education only some three or four mouths ago? The present Chief Secretary for Ireland had been absolutely explicit on this point, for he, rightly in his judgment, desired to encourage these hostels in connection with training colleges which were to be undenominational in their complexion, but he rightly held that corporate life with or without some denominational element ought to be added to the training colleges; and, if the right hon. Gentleman's words meant anything, they meant that equal treatment should be dealt out to these hostels whether they had a denominational element or whether they had not. That was the Chief Secretary's policy, and that policy had been abandoned by the President of the Board of Education, who had given no defence whatever for the abandonment. The third and the only other point to which he wished to refer was the attitude which the right hon. Gentleman had taken up in regard to the constitutional issue which he had raised two and a half hours ago. The point could be very shortly stated in this way. The Government found in force a section of an Act of Parliament from which they dissented. They did not propose to repeal the section, which would mean the introduction of a Bill, but they overrode it by voting money on the Estimates, which were embodied in the Appropriation Bill. Such a course was unprecedented and absolutely unconstitutional. The other day the House induced the Government in the case of the Army Bill to refuse to allow money to be given for military training in public elementary schools. If the Bill passed in that shape, any Government which took a different view had only to follow the precedent set by the Minister for Education by voting money on the Estimates, and the deliberate intention of the House, embodied in an Act of Parliament, would be defeated by what was nothing more nor less than a Ministerial fiat. He had no rooted objection, if the House desired to see a subvention of local authorities to aid in building schools, provided that subvention was used impartially between all schools, nor had he any objection to aid the local authority; but that carried with it a corresponding grant to Irish and Scottish education, and he presumed that the Scottish and Irish ratepayers would see that a corresponding grant was given to them. But at present nothing had been heard of it. While he did not object in principle to this aid being given to local authorities, he did ask the House seriously to consider whether it would be wise to start a new procedure which could be used in many directions, and whether it would not be wise even at some sacrifice to insist that the Government should remain in those well-worn and well-beaten paths of legislative tradition which were the only security, as far as he could see, for the will of that House and of Parliament being carried out. Let not the right hon. Gentleman suppose that he had uttered one word which diminished the objection on constitutional grounds to the action he had taken. He protested against that action, which had started a procedure which other authorities and other Governments must follow; a new weapon would be placed in the hands of the executive.

MR. McKENNA said it was not the power of this House that was in question. It was the power of the other House.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the right hon. Gentleman had long been a distinguished Member of the House, and was aware of the distinction that nominal legislative action taken through a vote in Supply was embodied in a Bill that was not discussed, and removed from the House one of its privileges. He regretted on the broadest ground what the right hon. Gentleman was doing; each Party in turn, as the pendulum of power swung from one side to the other, would regret it because the right hon. Gentleman's successors would, from the nature of the case, be compelled to use the weapon he had thus rashly forged.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) called attention to the supply of teachers for elementary schools. Nobody would deny that the supply was inadequate in number and inefficient in quality. The importance of the position held by a head teacher or a head mistress was admitted, but he regretted that the supply of teachers for elementary schools was far from satisfactory. According to the Report recently issued by the Board of Education, 13,500 new teachers would be required in the elementary schools in the year 1909, and in order to produce that number, 20,500 boys and girls should be introduced into the earlier stages of the profession in the year 1906. But the actual number entered that year was 10,900, which justified the statement in the Report that the prospect was an alarming one. But that was not all. Year by year there was an ever growing army of unqualified teachers being introduced into the schools. The total number of adult teachers in the elementary schools was about 136,000, and 20,000 of them were unqualified, a fact which gave the gravest disquietude to those engaged in the elementary schools of the country. The material of those entering as pupil-teachers was not altogether satisfactory, and that was shown by the extraordinary wastage in the ranks of the pupil-teachers. During the period of pupil-teachership and time of examination 35 per cent. either dropped out or were rejected. These facts emphasised the conclusion that the training of pupil-teachers should be a national service, the cost being defrayed out of the national exchequer. At present it was a duty imposed upon the local education authority, but he submitted they were not the proper authority to discharge it. The present system led to endless friction. One authority spent money in training teachers, and another authority attempted to take them away by offering larger salaries. Persons intended for teachers in elementary and secondary schools ought to be trained together if possible in connection with a university, so that they might enjoy the great advantage of association with those who intended to follow other professions. The gulf between the elementary and secondary teacher ought to be bridged over. The elementary school teacher ought to pass freely into the secondary schools, and inspectors ought to be appointed from the ranks of elementary teachers. Teaching in elementary schools should be made more attractive. At present there was not an adequate supply of boys for training, and it looked as if elementary teaching would become the monopoly of women, a thing to be deprecated in the interest of teaching in the higher standards. In Prussia there was an ample supply of men teachers, and he attributed that to the absence of any barrier, and any elementary teacher could aspire to the highest position in the teaching profession. So it should be in this country.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD referred to the regulations issued by the Department as having taken the House by surprise, and he very much regretted that the President had raised the religious question in relation to secondary education. These regulations would not raise the standard of secondary education. With regard to what had been said about the last occasion when this subject was discussed, the date was 15th of May, and it was late in the evening. He was informed that upon that occasion there were not fifty Members in the House. He wanted to know, in common with other Members, by what authority the right hon. Gentleman proposed these extraordinary changes. He thought if the right hon. Gentleman intended to proceed in this way, he would create a narrowing bureaucratic control with more centralization than ever. When they came to the question of reversing the policy of the late Government, the right hon. Gentleman must be aware that it would be very easy for other Governments to follow his example. He wanted to know the meaning of the words "for the present" in the preamble. Were these changes to take place every year or were they only experimental? He protested also against the right hon. Gentleman bringing in the religious difficulty in connection with secondary education. For many years those interested in secondary education had carefully and successfully avoided the religious difficulty. He heard the right hon. Gentleman the Under-Secretary for the Colonies describe himself recently as a controversial politician. He ventured to say that the President of the Board of Education had shown himself a more controversial politician than his right hon. friend. He seemed to have gone out of his way to drag the tail of his coat along the floor of the House, and to invite his friends to tread upon it. In many places with which he himself was acquainted the exemption from fees in connection with the secondary schools would not benefit the poorer scholars. It would benefit the sons of men living in a district who would be sent to an elementary school in order to qualify for the cheap education to be obtained at the secondary or grammar schools. The parents of these scholars would pay the charges for railway fares while their children were attending the schools in order that they might get the benefit of the grammar schools. Those connected with secondary education had always tried to raise its standard, but he believed the regulations, produced as he thought unconstitutionally, could not have that effect. Were the governors of a school appointed by a parish council or a parish meeting likely to assist in attaining a high standard in secondary education? What was wanted was more money for the secondary schools, so that the best scholars should be sent from the elementary schools, and not 25 per cent., some of whom might be good workmen, but who certainly would make very poor clerks. He did not think the regulations would do any good to secondary education. He regretted that the right hon. Gentleman had dragged in the House of Lords in connection with this controversy. He could not possibly know how the House of Lords would treat a Bill brought in by himself. The right hon. Gentleman had failed, up to the present time, to give any reason why a Bill had not been brought in to do what he now proposed to do by regulations. The regulations had not even been laid upon the Table of the House. At the appointed time the Minister of Education might send a letter to a secondary school, saying that if within fourteen days the governors did not accept one or other of the terms the school would be dealt with according to the regulations. He could see perfectly well that there would be consternation among the secondary schools, and among Members of that House who professed the Roman Catholic faith. What was now proposed was a gross interference with the Roman Catholic schools, but not more than was the case with the Church of England schools. They felt that they had been hardly dealt with, and that they were being made to suffer in a way which they would not have expected in connection with secondary education.

Mr. MASTERMAN (West Ham, N.) said he did not propose to follow hon. Members who had dealt with the question of the new regulations. He did not underestimate the seriousness of that matter, but he thought they had had a full discussion of it on both sides. He held strong opinions on some of those regulations, but he did not wish at present to press them upon the Committee. He desired to bring before the President of the Board of Education one or two vital questions affecting something that was almost lost sight of in education debates, namely, the welfare of the children. The first question was with reference to the administration of the Act passed last autumn as to the provision of meals for school children. It would be altogether out of order and entirely irrelevant to discuss the provisions of the Act. What he was concerned with at present was its administration, but he might be allowed to say that the form of the Act made some difficulty in that matter. The Act was not mandatory, and it provided no Imperial money for the work. It represented one of the attempts, all too common, to carry out a great social reform at somebody else's expense if possible, and failing that, with as little expenditure of public money as possible. Although some hon. Members recognised when the Bill was passing that the absence of such provisions would make it extremely difficult to carry out, they were kept silent by the assertion that if they attempted to obtain modifications in these matters the whole Bill would be dropped. That was the usual method of getting rid of any Amendment which happened to be tedious or difficult. The intention of the House was that in future, after the Bill came into operation, no child who needed nourishment should go underfed while attending a public elementary school, and various arrangements were made whereby the sordid, neglectful, or drunken parent should be punished later on if his neglect or drunkenness was proved. The Board of Education issued regulations in January last in connection with the carrying out of the Act. The comparative failure of the Act—for it had been a comparative failure—was largely due to the manner it which it was brought before the attention of local authorities. The reply of the President of the Board of Education would probably be that the Act had only been in operation for a short time, but unless the right hon. Gentleman took more active steps than he had done so far it would continue to be a failure. Few local towns had asked to use the rating power in the matter, and London, where by far the greater number of necessitous children were to be found, had not said anything about the Act. The ratepayers of West Ham had been offered facilities for being allowed to pay for the feeding of poor children, a privilege which they possessed before the Act was passed. The circular issued by the Board of Education contained the following—

> "The Board will consider the circumstances of the case and the extent of the emergency which has to be met, and will also require to know what sum the authority consider to be necessary to meet so much of the cost of the provision of food for a stated period as cannot be paid for in any other manner, together with the grounds for that view. The Board do not propose to give any permanent sanction or even one extending over a period of years. They will deal in each case with the particular emergency and then sanction will, as a rule, be limited to the raising of a definite sum from the Votes."

Parliament very definitely declared that arrangements were to be made to provide food for necessitous children, and there was nothing in the Act in regard to special circumstances and emergencies. He was sure that hon. Members went away for their Christmas holidays buoyed up with the pleasant thought that under the Act it would be the duty of the President of the Board of Education to see that every single child attending the schools in future was in a fit condition to receive education. Therefore, he thought it right to ask the President of the Board of Education, even if he could not promise anything in the nature of a monetary grant, to see that a circular was issued more compatible with the desire of Parliament in the matter, and urging local authorities to see that the Act was fully carried out even if it should mean the full expenditure of the ½d. rate allowed by the Act. He wanted to know also what policy was to be followed concerning the administration of the grants to what were called necessitous areas, one of which he was in the fortunate or the unfortunate position of representing. North-West Ham was one of the most flagrant examples of a necessitous area. For two years the Board had given a certain grant towards those authorities which had a high education rate. Over 6d. in the £ a certain proportion of the rate was paid by the central authority. There was no kind of promise made, so far as he knew, by which this grant should be put upon a permanent basis. He did not think the grant was sufficient in its present form, though he agreed that some of the necessitous districts would be absolutely unable to carry on the work of education if they did not get that grant, but he did not think it was a satisfactory solution of the tremendous variation in the incidence of the education rate. He would tell the right hon. Gentleman of one unfortunate effect of his action in the matter, which he should be very glad if he could see any means of rectifying. When the local authorities of East London explained to the right hon. Gentleman the impossibility of carrying on the work of education without some such grant in districts such as they came from, having more poor children than any other district, having a lower rateable value, and having, as new districts without voluntary schools, the greater necessity for expenditure upon building new schools, he repeated practically the advice his predecessor had given; he stated that he would give the grant his predecessor had given, but he very strongly urged, as his predecessor had urged, the representatives of those local authorities to exercise every kind of economy they could in the matter themselves, and he practically established the position that the continuance of that grant depended upon the enforcement of a rigid economy. Filled with a kind of panic at any suggestion of losing the grant, the City Fathers of West Ham proceeded to carry out the advice which they had received from so high an authority, and not being able to make a reduction in their schools or the building of new schools, because the schools were forced upon them by the Board of Education, for which they afterwards had to pay, they set themselves to cut down the scale of salaries of their teachers, and the result was that a large section of the teachers had now gone on strike, and the town hall was weekly turned into the position of a bear garden. They were fighting the best organised and strongest of the trade unions in the country, and he thought the least the President of the Board of Education could do in the matter, if he would not agree to bear the expense of both sides in this unhappy warfare, was to make an offer to arbitrate between the contending parties and try to put an end to a dispute which, however humorously it might be regarded from outside, was doing infinite harm to the cause of education in one of the most necessitous boroughs in the country. He asked, apart from this dispute, whether the right hon. Gentleman could not give some kind of indication as to his future policy with regard to the necessitous districts. The whole of the local and educational administration of all these boroughs was disturbed by the uncertainty in regard to the grant. In his own borough its absence meant a rate of 1s. in the £, and he asked them to believe that the few comparatively well-off residents they had were inclined to move out of the borough on account of the fear that next March, or some other time, there might suddenly come an addition to their rates of 1s. in the £. The third question to which he wanted a reply was in connection with the organisation of a central medical department of the Board of Education. He did not see any provision in the Estimates for the organisation of such a department. The principle of medical inspection was practically unanimously accepted by both parties in the House last July, but if left entirely to the local authority that inspection would in many cases be carried out in a perfunctory manner. He asked the right hon. Gentleman to make a definite declaration that night that he would see that there was an organised department to supervise the work of the local departments, and to co-ordinate the results and in that way establish what he was certain would be received with gratification by representatives of every Party in the House. His last point was in connection with the Code issued that week. The right hon. Gentleman was familiar with the fact that many members had for some years past been pleading for the introduction into the Code of definite moral instruction. It was introduced by the predecessor of the right hon. Gentleman last year, and it stood in the Code this year, but it stood as a voluntary subject, with no syllabus and no indication as to what the central authority really meant by moral instruction. But they wanted it made a compulsory subject, as essential as arithmetic or history in the working of the curriculum; and was it not possible that the right hon. Gentleman might redeem this moral instruction from a certain amount of obloquy owing, as he thought, to the unsatisfactory method in which it was sometimes carried out? Many people now thought moral instruction meant studied aphorisms, such as that honesty was the best policy, which was not always true—he was applauded from the Front Opposition Bench, so he thought he must be right—or discussions upon the effect of alcohol upon the human heart. That kind of arid moral aphorisms would make the children hate the idea of such a lesson, but there could be organised, through history and biography, and the daily course of events in the life of the child, a moral instruction which would also include civic instruction in the love of one's country, and the appreciation of duty, which would have none of the defects which were at present associated with the teaching of morals through religion in our schools, and which, if it ever came to pass, and it might not be so very far distant when religious instruction was no longer paid for in their schools, and when a certain number of children would not receive religious instruction, would at least guarantee that they received some kind of idealistic teaching beyond that of needlework, handwriting, and arithmetic. He had often apologised in that House for the time he had occupied in these interminable religious wrangles, but he made no apology for the time he had occupied that evening on the question. If the right hon. Gentleman could give them children in their schools well nourished, free from the obvious physical defects which could be cured by medical inspection, clean in body and mind, they would take very good care to look after the religion, quite apart from State action altogether. These were the questions which were the kernel of all social reforms—the hope, the security, and the defence of the nation.

LORD EDMUND TALBOT (Sussex, Chichester) said he rose because the right hon. Gentleman opposite had endeavoured to make light of the remarks made by the hon. Member for Kerry and the hon. Member for Clare when they said that their co-religionists, and his, in this country, would look upon these regulations with regard to training colleges and secondary education as a declaration of war. He could assure the right hon. Gentleman that if he thought the Catholics were going to accept these regulations in anything like a quiet manner he was very much mistaken. They resented very much the conduct of the Government in having brought them forward with so little notice. Notwithstanding what had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman with reference to his speech in May last, they considered that they ought to have had more time to consider the regulations. The Government themselves chose that day for the Education Vote. It was only about the middle of last week that they issued the regulations for the secondary schools. The Code was issued, he thought, last Friday, and these new regulations for training colleges only appeared on the pink Paper that morning. They considered that in taking that hurried course the Government were attempting to shirk discussion on the question, and he wished to warn the right hon. Gentleman that at any rate his co-religionists in this country felt very deeply and very acutely the action he had taken. Notwithstanding the extremely short time that the regulations had been made known to the country, he had already received many letters, especially from the North, calling his attention in tones of dismay to what they meant. This was not a matter affecting the rich. The Catholics were divided in political matters, but they were absolutely united as one man on the question of the education of the children of the poor. If these regulations were carried out, it would be the death blow of the Catholic teachers of the children of the poor. They did not intend that they should be deprived of Catholic teachers for their Catholic poor, and he warned the right hon. Gentleman of the nature of the struggle upon which he was embarking.

*MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) referred to the appeal of the hon. Member for West Ham. He thought that if the right hon. Gentleman found it in his power or in his heart to attempt to bring the parties in the dispute referred to together round a table, that might be a useful piece of work on his part, and a friendly act indeed. The hon. Member for West Ham had also appealed to the President of the Board of Education to add another subject to the time table of the public elementary schools and to see that moral instruction of a certain kind was made obligatory.

And, it being a quarter-past Eight of the clock, and there being Private Business set down by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (GENERAL POWERS) BILL (BY ORDER).

Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill, as amended, be now considered."

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.) moved that the Bill be further considered on that day three months. His reason for doing so was that the Bill had been very largely altered since the original measure was introduced A number of clauses dealing with very important sanitary improvements had been struck out. Clause 85, a most reasonable and fair clause, had disappeared altogether. The effect of the clause was that no premises within the county of London should be deemed to be exempt from the Common Lodging Houses Acts, as amended by the London County Council (Powers) Act of 1902 and in other ways, because the people lodging in them were not harboured for hire or lodged for a period exceeding a week at a time. That clause simply gave power to the London County Council to inspect lodging-houses for sanitary purposes. It was a power enjoyed by and wisely conferred on every large corporation in the country in order that they might deal with the lodging-houses in the area under their control. He thought the House might well ask why had that clause been struck out when similar clauses reasonable in themselves and necessary for the health of London had been granted to other municipalities.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) asked Mr. Speaker whether his hon. friend was in order in moving the rejection of the Bill on the ground that it did not contain a particular clause.

*MR. SPEAKER said he thought the hon. Member was entitled to do so.

MR. T. L. CORBETT, continuing, said the reason why this clause did not appear in the Bill as it came down from upstairs was because the Roman Catholic Church party went to the London County Council and said that if the clause were not omitted from the Bill they would block the Measure, which contained various other provisions which were a necessary part of the work of the London County Council, at every stage in the House of Commons. He was not going to say a word against the Roman Catholic Church or their attitude, because the help of that and of all Churches was wanted in dealing with the problem of the poor, but he would ask why this constant policy against inspection was pursued. It seemed to him to be the gravest indictment that could be brought against the Roman Catholic Church, and while he could understand some feeling being aroused about religious institutions and the inspection of convents and monasteries, he could not understand why there should be any feeling against the inspection of lodging-houses. It came to this: the Roman Catholic Church and High Church institutions happened to own a number of lodging-houses in London, but for reasons known to themselves, and known to themselves alone, they objected to any inspection whatever of those places, and said that at whatever risk to the health of London they must go uninspected. The claims of the Roman Catholic Church and of their ritualistic allies were always high, but when they were going to paralyse the work of the London County Council in carrying out a plain sanitary duty, not only were they high but they became intolerable. It was on that ground that he brought forward this Motion for rejection. He begged to move.

MR. G. A. HARDY (Suffolk, Stowmarket), in seconding the Motion, said he felt that this was a very grave matter and that it was a question which ought to be brought before the House. For a great body like the London County Council in its work of the inspection of lodging-houses to be set aside from that purpose because a particular denomination said that they would block a particular Bill at every stage was bringing coercion to bear upon the House, and it was for that reason and that reason alone that he was prepared to second the Motion. They knew very well that unless lodging-houses were inspected there was liability to grave misuse of the privileges they had, and he hoped in the interest of London the power of the London County Council, a great and upright institution, might be upheld against the high-handed actions of a particular Church in regard to this measure.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. T. L. Corbett.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' sand part of the Question."

*MR. CLELAND (Glasgow, Bridgeton) hoped that the proposal which had been put forward would not commend itself to the House, because if the Bill were rejected it would mean administrative chaos in the county of London. The provision to which the hon. Member had alluded was debated in the House on his own Motion on the Second Reading of the Bill, and he could not help regretting that the hon. Member had thought fit to bring it up again on the Report stage. The Bill had been subjected to careful criticism and had been improved upstairs, and he hoped the Amendment would not be carried, because if it were a measure which was very valuable, having regard to the good government of London, would be absolutely destroyed. The Bill was vital for the good government of London and would carry out many needed improvements connected with the meat supply, the purity of milk, the cleansing of wells and sewers, the prevention of floods, and the main drainage of London. All these important and non-controversial improvements would have to stand over if this Bill were defeated. The measure also contained certain necessary powers to enable local authorities to purchase land for open spaces, and these, with the other subjects he had mentioned, would be postponed for at least twelve months and would involve these local bodies in serious difficulties in regard to the health of London. He therefore hoped that the hon. Member, having again made his protest, would allow this measure, nine-tenths of which was non-controversial and almost all of which was agreed upon by all the parties concerned, and by members of both parties in the County Council, to proceed.

MR. LAYLAND-BARRATT (Devonshire, Torquay) as Chairman of the Committee which considered the Bill, asked the House to reject the Amendment. The Bill had been carefully considered by the Committee upstairs, and what the hon. Gentleman had said in regard to this particular clause never came before them, and he could endorse everything that had been said as to the value of the other clauses which appeared in the Bill. It would be a serious thing for London if the Bill was not passed into law.

*MR. RADFORD (Islington, E.) did not think the provision in regard to the inspection of lodging-houses had been dropped out for any religious reason, but because the promoters of charity in London wanted to do charity on the cheap, and he thought the time had come when those who wanted to do charity on the cheap should provide shelters on terms satisfactory to the sanitary authorities, or else they would have to go out of the business. Lodging-houses run for charitable purposes probably had some ulterior religious purpose into which they need not inquire, but he agreed with the Chairman of the Committee and the hon. Member for Glasgow that there was a great amount of good stuff in the Bill which they could not afford to lose, and he hoped his hon. friend, after his protest would withdraw the Amendment.

MR. T. L. CORBETT felt it impossible not to respond to the appeal which had been made to him on the ground that if the Bill did not pass the work of the London County Council would be interfered with. He hoped, however, those in charge of the Bill would convey to their colleagues on the London County Council the opinion that there were other parties who had to be considered.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill, as amended, considered.

*MR. LEIF JONES, in moving the omission of Clause 55, said the clause, though it was in a private Bill, was one of far-reaching and national importance, for it would enable the council to set up a supplementary scheme of pensions for any persons now or hereafter in the employ of the council who would be or would become entitled to any pension or superannuation allowance from any source other than the ordinary pension fund of the council. The effect of the clause was to enable the council to set up a supplementary pension scheme for teachers in provided schools. The clause was not in the Bill when it was read a second time in the House. The House had no cognisance of it, and he knew of no precedent for adding a clause of this far-reaching import in Committee. The proposal in the clause was novel, and though that was no condemnation in his eyes he thought its utility ought to be proved. But they had had no word of justification, and before the House voted he hoped to show that the proposal of the clause was unsound financially, and from an educational point of view must lead to disastrous results. In the first place it provided for the possibility of pensions for teachers in provided schools and not in unprovided schools, which was a most undesirable distinction to draw. If teachers in the provided schools were to have pensions, the teachers in the unprovided schools, who belonged to the same class, should also have them. The pensions should extend to both. But if the Amendment of the noble Lord the Member for Marylebone was accepted, the position would be that the London County Council would be authorised to set up a pension scheme subsidised out of the London rates for people who were not in the employ of the ratepayers, and a principle more unsound financially could not be imagined. He disclaimed at once any hostility to the teachers in this matter, but the teachers were not wholly without pensions. There was already a national scheme to which the teachers contributed, and to which a large subsidy was paid out of the taxes, and teachers of all schools in all parts of the country could acquire pensions under that scheme, although he agreed that the scale of pensions was wholly inadequate. This was a national duty and not a local duty, and he would gladly assist hon. friends in the House to put the teachers on the same footing as other officials of the State. If it was to be done it should be done out of the taxes, and not out of the rates, which were already too heavily burdened. This scheme was likely to add £30,000 or £40,000 to the rates of London, and he could not think that this was the time, when all opinion was moving in the direction of reducing the burden of the rates, to bring in such a scheme. One objection to the scheme of the Bill passed with this clause in it, and if it became a precedent, was that they would have the country divided up into pension and no pension, or good pension and bad pension, areas, which would only enhance the difficulties which local authorities now found in obtaining suitable teachers. Directly a teacher came into a particular area he would be tied to it, because if he left he would lose all the benefit derived under the scheme. If they allowed local authorities to set up schemes of this character they would expose them also to great pressure at the hands of the organised teachers of the country. Such pressure might be overwhelming, because the teachers were well organised—they were the friends of the parents of the children in the district in which they taught, and could wield immense influence with those who were the voters. It was not wise to delegate to a local authority a power which the House should keep to itself. The power given under this clause was vague and undefined, and it was undesirable that a scheme for pensions which should be national and not local should be undertaken by a local authority. He begged to move.

*Mr. WOOD (Glasgow, St. Rollox), in seconding the Amendment, said he did so not as a member of the County Council nor as representing any section of its members, but he believed he would have the sympathy of the Fnance Committee of the Council for the course he was taking, and probably of the Parliamentary Committee also. He seconded the Amendment as a Scottish Member, because he believed that this question would come before the House in the same form under a scheme for Scotland. He submitted that it was a very undesirable form of procedure which would prejudice the national question by inserting a clause in Committee in a private Bill. It affected not only England but Scotland. England had provided and non-provided teachers and Scotland had the teachers of the voluntary schools and the teachers of the board schools, and a difficulty arose, when they made a complementary scheme for the board school teachers, with regard to the position of the voluntary school teachers, because it was difficult to see how the boards were to deal with a class of teachers who were not their servants. He himself thought that those who were doing similar service should not be treated differently; he had never been one of those who believed in making teachers suffer at all because of political matters, and he had always as a member of the London County Council desired to see equal treatment of both classes of teachers. He was prepared to admit that if the clause were passed it would be very difficult to resist the Amendments of hon. Gentlemen opposite. He thought the clause very unfortunate altogether, and he seconded the Amendment not only in the interests of the local authorities but in the interests of the teachers themselves, and he believed that some distinguished representatives of the teachers shared his views. This proposal might be of advantage to teachers in London, but it would not be of advantage to the general body of teachers. It placed the teacher in London in an altogether different position. If the clause were passed, undoubtedly the London County Council would have to spend every shilling of the £33,000 which it reckoned it would cost. For many reasons this was unsatisfactory, even in the interests of teachers. He agreed that the present system of superannuation was inadequate, but the real remedy was to make it adequate not only for teachers in London but for teachers throughout the length and breadth of the land. That was the thing at which the teachers should aim, and not a piecemeal advantage which differentiated between teachers and caused great inequalities between those in one locality and those in another. Though teachers were under local management they were really national servants, as was shown by the fact of the State's having set up a national system of superannuation. He could imagine nothing more unsound or undesirable than having a national system and a supplementary local system. It tended to injustice and inequality. He also supported the Amendment in the interest of the non-provided teacher. They could imagine the case of two localities where one had the disposition and ample means to make a complementary scheme and the other had not, so that one set of teachers would receive much better treatment than another of equal merit. As a result they would have localisation of teachers, which was a bad thing. They wanted country teachers to come to London and London teachers to go to the country. But if they had a scheme such as this clause proposed they would keep the teachers in London for the whole of their career. He did not believe in the system of London for the Londoners, or Manchester people for Manchester, in the case of teachers. He wanted to see the service a national service in which there was a constant interchange between one locality and another. The matter was of such general interest that he could not help thinking that they might have had some declaration from the Government on the subject. He did not think it ought to be dealt with in a private Bill and by a special clause put in with very short notice to the House, because it involved interests which affected every district of the country and should be decided on national considerations.

Amendment proposed to the Bill.—

"In page 37, line 1, to leave out Clause 55." —(*Mr. Leif Jones.*)

Mr. Leif Jones.

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the second word 'the,' in page 37, line 7, stand part of the Bill."

*Mr. YOXALL said the case of the teachers was so strong that the Committee had inserted the clause although it had failed to pass the County Council. His hon. friend the Member for Appleby had said that the teachers had very great power and influence, but half the teachers were women and had no votes and therefore could not exercise influence on that House or on local authorities. The result was that they could not bring to bear on the Treasury or on local authorities influences, occult, abstract, or practical, which his hon. friend appeared to fear. They had sought a *locus standi* before the Committee of that House, and the Committee had decided, in order to do justice to their case, on an Amendment of the Bill. It was rather unfair fighting on the part of his hon. friend afterwards to say that influence had been brought to bear of an improper nature.

*Mr. LEIF JONES said he had never made any suggestion as to the exercise of improper influence; at any rate, he had not intended to do so, and if he had said anything which bore that construction he at once withdrew it.

*Mr. YOXALL said that had been the impression left on his mind by what the hon. Member had said, but he accepted the explanation of the hon. Gentleman that he did not make any charge of that kind and withdrew it if he did. The London County Council approached the House with a private Bill in order, among other things, to obtain powers to extend the system of superannuation of officers, which went as far back as 1891. In that year the teachers were under the School Board; by the Act of 1902 they came under the County Council. It was unfair to draw a distinction between one officer and another, and teachers were officers of the London County Council. But this Bill made a distinction, and a clerk in the service of the London County Council with a salary of £160 a year was entitled to retire at the age of sixty-five on a pension of £120 a year; whereas a teacher of the same age and with the same amount of salary would only receive a national pension of £60 a year. He said nothing against clerks at all; their work was most important; but he did not think it was quite so arduous or skilled as that of the teacher, and he was quite sure that at sixty-five the earnest teacher would be more worn out than would the clerk at that age. Teachers were officers of the London County Council, and as officers they ought to participate in the superannuation scheme. The hon. Member's argument about localising teachers had considerable weight. But this was not a precedent. There was a local pension scheme in Manchester, in Newcastle, and at Croydon, and, in all these places, why should they be allowed under private Acts to have local pension schemes, while the London County Council was not to be allowed to have one? The House had been told that teachers were "not wholly without pensions." No, they were not. The teacher employed by the London County Council became a pupil teacher at fourteen years of age, and, with the exception of two years at the training college, from that age up to sixty-five was employed in teaching. At present under the national scheme on retiring there was the magnificent provision of £66 a year for the man and £44 for the woman, two-thirds of the amount, and, in some instances, more than two-thirds, arising from the annuity which was purchased with the contributions of the teachers during all those years. His hon. friend the Member for the St. Rollox division was willing to reward the services of the clerk at sixty-five with a pension of £120, but he would not, for general and national reasons, allow the teacher under the London County Council to retire on a similar pension. Many hon. Members of the House knew the conditions of things with regard to the national pension fund, and how could they expect that in years to come they would so improve that fund as to provide the same pensionable benefits as this Bill would give? That was a simple matter of justice. The Bill itself did not give any pensions; it was simply an enabling Bill. Clause 55, which it was proposed to omit, enabled the London County Council, if they so desired, to get over a technical difficulty arising out of the existence of the National Pension Fund. All it provided was that if and when the County Council pleased they might so arrange the complementary scheme that the income of the teacher at sixty-five years of age should, from the complementary and the national pension schemes together, amount to as large a superannuation allowance as he would have had if he had been a clerk or other servant of the council during that period. The clause was not mandatory. When the London County Council pleaded the existence of the national pension scheme, and that the Board of Education would have a right to say something in this matter and might bring in a veto, the Committee went into the matter with great care with the representatives of the Treasury and the Board of Education. There were 11,000 or 12,000 certificated teachers in the London area, and therefore there were plenty of opportunities for changing schools. After full investigation the Treasury and the Board of Education said they took no exception to this proposal, and it was willingly adopted by the Committee. The proposal, which was passed unanimously by the Committee, merely enabled the County Council to do an act of justice. He did not think the House had any right to exclude, for the abstract reasons which had been put forward, the teachers from receiving the same benefits as were given to clerks and others in the employ of the London County Council. They heard a good deal about good-will towards teachers and a high appreciation of their work. When one reflected upon how they were paid and superannuated, one did not wonder that there was a shortage of teachers for public elementary schools. Money was being spent upon bursaries and scholarships in order to try to remedy this state of things, but those efforts would be futile because they were artificial, and the way to remedy the evil was to improve the position of the teacher in regard to pay and pensions. It would pay the London County Council and the nation in the end to adopt this Bill for London, and he hoped the House would refuse to adopt the Amendment.

*Mr. CLELAND (Glasgow, Bridgeton) said it was perfectly true that this clause was not in the Bill when it passed its Second Reading, but when the question of superannuation was being discussed upstairs the claim put forward on behalf of the teachers so impressed the representatives of the London County Council that this clause was brought up as an agreed clause between the representatives of the Council and the teachers. Consequently this was not a case of a Committee having put something upon unwilling promoters. He had very little doubt or hesitation in prophesying that if this Bill were passed it would be put into effect in the London district. Not merely the pressure of the teachers, but the pressure of popular opinion would be brought to bear upon the Council in regard to the unfairness with which the teachers were being treated as compared with the clerks in the service of the Council. The hon. Member for the St. Rollox division had stated that the teachers were not the servants of the Council. He did not know whether the hon. Member's law was right or wrong, but he knew that the London County Council were held responsible under the Workmen's Compensation Act for anything that might happen to the teachers, and although they might not technically be servants of the Council they were in this respect in the same position as the clerks employed by the London County Council. The hon. Member for the Appleby division had stated that the rich districts would bring forward a proper scheme of superannuation and the poor districts would not be able to do so. He did not see why that should be a reason for handicapping a district which was prepared to put its hand in its pocket and pay for education the need of which was so evident. Be that as it might, by omitting this clause they would not prevent a district which was not willing to contribute to these pensions from attracting the best of the teaching profession. The hon. Member for Nottingham had told the House something in regard to the position of these teachers. He would take one case to show the exact position in which the teachers were placed at the present moment. An Act of Parliament was passed in 1898 called the Elementary Schools Instruction Superannuation Act, under which male teachers contributed £3 5s. per annum to a fund and women teachers £2 4s. per annum. If they took it that a man started paying into this fund at the age of twenty-three and a woman at the same age, when they retired after more than forty years arduous service the male teacher would be entitled to a pension of £37 8s. per annum out of this fund and a woman teacher to £19 4s. 4d. The Treasury had recognised the inadequacy of this fund and they were now supplementing it by an allowance of 10s. per annum of recorded service, and so the maximum sum after more than forty years service would be a little under £60 for a male teacher and £40 for a female teacher. The hon. Member had pleaded for delay and had asked that this question should be brought forward by the Government and dealt with as a national question. He had a good deal of sympathy with that point of view, but as a Scottish Member he could not help recollecting that for the last five years they had had successive Education Bills for Scotland brought forward and this year they had got another, and there did not seem to be any great prospect of its being passed into law. In the interests of education he hoped the House would not delete this clause. He favoured the acceptance of an Amendment which stood on the Paper in the name of the noble Lord the Member for Marylebone because he believed that if this clause was carried even as it stood, and more especially if carried as it was proposed to amend it, it would place an opportunity within the power of the rich districts to make the teaching service a thoroughly well-remunerated one and of attracting to the metropolis the best available teachers.

Sir HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) said he was prepared cordially to support this clause. He did not, however, think that the inconvenience was quite got over by the argument which had been used by last speaker. It was one thing to pay a larger salary for a particular locality, but it should not be forgotten that if they organised the teachers in this way under a superannuation system there would be a danger that they might prevent them from having that free movement over the country which was for the advantage of the teaching profession and the country generally. So strongly did he feel the need of some improvement in the superannuation system that he should vote wholeheartedly for this clause. In so doing he wished to point out that he would be returning a good action for a very bad one. When the Superannuation Act of 1898 was passed, acting in accordance with the wishes of Scotland, he was extremely anxious that the Scottish school boards should retain their power of adding to the superannuation grant out of their own funds. That power vested in the school boards of Scotland under the Act of 1872, but it was subsequently repealed. He thought Scotland was treated unfairly in the matter. He asked hon. Members to remember that the Government of the day acted under pressure brought by the National Union of Teachers in England; he stood up for the Union of Elementary Teachers in Scotland as long as he could. He would support the clause on the distinct understanding that there were to be no invidious distinctions, and that what was proposed would be extended to all classes of teachers.

*MR. RADFORD (Islington, E.) said his experience as a member of the Education Committee of the London County Council did not enable him to admit the claim as to the modesty of teachers in advancing their demands. On the contrary, he should like to say that, next to the clergy, teachers appeared to be the most sturdy and clamorous beggars to be found in the country. In regard to Private Bill legislation and other matters the organised teachers were very well able to look after themselves. His objection to this clause was that it was an enabling clause. It was being forced upon the County Council by the teachers. He wanted to know what was the scheme with respect to which the London County Council and the organised teachers had come to an agreement. He thought it was proper that the House should have an opportunity of considering that pension scheme. There was no such scheme before the House; they were asked to give the London County Council and the teachers a blank cheque.

LORD R. CECIL protested against the view that apparently existed among hon. Members as to the kind of procedure that took place before a Private Bill Committee. The hon. Member for the Appleby division did not make any charge against the impartiality of the Committee, but he appeared to think that the Committee had been influenced by considerations other than those represented to them in the speeches of counsel.

*MR. LEIF JONES: What I intended to say was that after this Bill left the House influences were brought to bear on the London County Council, and that an "agreed clause" was presented to the Committee upstairs.

LORD R. CECIL said he understood now what the hon. Member meant. He did not wish to let it go abroad that a Private Bill Committee were subject to any influences except the arguments which were presented to them. The hon. Member for East Islington had suggested that the House should have the details of the superannuation scheme before it passed the clause. Surely the hon. Gentleman could scarcely be serious in saying that the House should enter on the details of the scheme. That might be a proper matter for the Committee upstairs, but it would be impossible for the House to arrive at a fair judgment as to whether the scheme was a proper one or not. The London County Council had already a pension scheme for their other employees, and he could not conceive why teachers should be less entitled to pensions than the other officers. That appeared to be the whole case for the clause. The hon. Member for the St. Rollox division had argued that it was improper that the London County Council should be allowed to set a precedent in this matter for the rest of the country. He himself hesitated to accept the view that the greatest education authority in the country should be debarred from doing what was now proposed. Whether a superannuation scheme would or would not be right for the whole country was a question which the House was not at present considering. Almost everything the hon. Member had said as to the disadvantages of variations in pensions in different places applied also to salaries.

He had always thought that there was a good deal to be said for throwing the expense of teachers upon a central fund and not upon the rates.

Mr. LAYLAND-BARRATT (Devonshire, Torquay) said that as Chairman of the Committee who considered the Bill he would like to make a brief statement as to the reasons which actuated them in coming to their decision. The Amendment which his hon. friend had moved was not put on the Paper, and he was therefore in the awkward position of not having had an opportunity of consulting the other Members of the Committee except one. The decision of the Committee was absolutely unanimous in regard to the insertion of this clause. He therefore supported the retention of the clause in the Bill. There was no scheme in the Bill because this was only an enabling clause giving the County Council power to deal with a particular situation when it arose. The Committee after carefully considering the clause came to the conclusion that they were justified in allowing it to be inserted in the Bill. It was an "agreed clause," but he hoped the House would not think that it did not receive the careful consideration of the Committee. The noble Lord opposite, who had practised before Private Bill Committees, would support him when he said that Committees were always more careful about agreed clauses than about others.

Question put, and agreed to.

Lord R. CECIL moved an Amendment placing teachers in non-provided schools on the same footing as those in provided schools under Clause 55 of the Bill. The non-provided school teachers were paid by the county councils, and it seemed to him that if the provided school teachers might have a pension, there could be no other than a technical reason why non-provided teachers should not receive a pension. They ought to stand on the same footing, and he, therefore, trusted the House would accept the Amendment which stood in his name.

Sir F. BANBURY (City of London) seconded.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 37, line 7, after the word 'of,' to insert the words 'or employed in institutions maintained by."—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*Mr. CLELAND (Glasgow, Bridgeton) declared that he was authorised to say on behalf of the promoters of the Bill—although they had not yet as a body had an opportunity of coming to a decision on it—that the two most important Committees concerned in the matter agreed with the effect of the Amendment. He thought, therefore, he was justified, both as representing the promoters there, and, also from his own point of view, in stating that whatever might be their views with regard to the educational policy and the Education Act passed by the late Government, and, however much they might desire to see that amended at the earliest possible moment, it could not be just or fair to penalise the teachers of the non-provided schools who had no responsibility in regard to the passing of the Act.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill to be read the third time.

SUPPLY (CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES).

Postponed Proceeding on Motion made on consideration of Question, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,593,646, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the salaries and expenses of the Board of Education, and of the various Establishments connected therewith, including Grants for the Building of new Public Elementary Schools and sundry Grants in Aid:—"

Which Motion was, "That Item A (1) (Salaries, Wages, and Allowances) be reduced by £100."—(*Mr. Boland*)—resumed.

*Mr. YOXALL said he gathered to his surprise that the hon. Member for North West Ham was prepared to supplant some portion if not all of the instruction now given in the Christian faith in the various schools in the country, by a process or syllabus of moral education which, he supposed, would occupy the time now given to the Bible lessons, and if the right hon. Gentleman should decide to make obligatory a course of moral education, whether by texts, or by proverbs, or by mottoes, he was sure it could only be made obligatory during the hours at present devoted to the Scriptural system of instruction in the schools. He did not suppose that any considerable body of opinion in that House, except on the Labour Benches, would be in favour of devoting a portion of the time now taken in giving Scriptural instruction to a course of organised moral instruction. He would take that opportunity of protesting against the idea current among certain Members that, unless they placed a subject on the time-table, with a syllabus for it, and a name, and definite and regular hours in the day or week to teach it, and a careful examination in it, and reports upon it by local and Government inspectors, the subject could not possibly be taught. There was no teacher in the public elementary schools to-day worth his salt, who was not all day long and every day giving moral instruction in the best possible way, not by text or proverb, but by example and by the emanation of personality, and that was the only proper method, both as regarded moral instruction and hygiene and temperance. He begged the right hon. Gentleman not to codify and syllabify these subjects, because if he did their very object would be defeated, the letter would kill the spirit which at present in so many cases was alive. He did not join in the criticisms which had been made against the right hon. Gentleman with regard to secondary schools and training colleges. He thought he had taken a step in the right direction by democratising their secondary school system, and so long as he democratised that system and made it efficient, he did not care about other considerations. Similarly, with regard to the training college arrangements, though he thought in practice the fears expressed that night would be by no means realised, after all, in providing that the selection of the entrants to a training college should be made upon their educational merits, and upon that alone, in cases where, other things being equal, there were too many candidates for one place, the right hon. Gentleman would make the colleges more efficient for the teachers and would remove a standing source of injustice and irritation, whereby a teacher, high up in the list on merits, had been unable to obtain admission, because his place was filled by a candidate low in the list on merits, who happened to fulfil a denominational test which the higher candidate did not fulfil. His right hon. friend had done well with regard to the secondary schools as a beginning, and he hoped he meant to go on in the same way. He had done well in respect to the training colleges, and now he must turn his attention to the elementary schools. He thought that night, wise as was his speech, cautious as was his attitude, and cogent as were his reasons, perhaps the right hon. Gentleman was a little too much afraid of what was the real opinion of the local education authorities. He knew that discretion was the better part of valour sometimes, but sometimes also valour was the better part of discretion, and he should like to see him a little more valiant in demanding from the local authorities those improvements which could be obtained by pressure applied by the Board of Education. He would like to refer next to the question of air space. The minimum now allowed in a council school of ten square feet of air space on the floor and fifteen feet above that per child, was less than the air space required for a man in prison or for the inmate of a workhouse. They talked about national decay, race suicide, diminishing height and weight, but the real thing was to begin with more sanitary conditions for the child, and they could not have any improvement if from 9 a.m. till 12 noon, and from 2 p.m. till 4.30 p.m., the child had to swelter in a crowded room, overpacked, with an air space which at the best represented about as much air as was contained in a yard and a half cube. If they put a boy into a school-room which, built for sixty or seventy children, contained ten square feet on the floor, and fifteen feet above, air space for him, but into which were crowded 80 to 130 children, where did their ten square feet basis come in then? A boy could not breathe in that area. That was going on all over the country and not by any means in the non-provided schools alone. It existed again and again in the council schools and provided schools, and if there was an excuse for it in the non-provided schools because they had not been built out of the resources of the ratepayers, there could be no excuse for the local authorities in the case of the provided schools, with the full resources of the rates at their disposal, refusing to give the children a proper supply of air. He knew of schools not far away where 100 and 103 children were packed into rooms built and intended and measured out and authorised for sixty alone. The delay of reform was sometimes asked for in the name of economy and on behalf of the ratepayers. But he did not believe that plea was a sound one, and he was sure the whole of the ratepayers would rally in favour of his right hon. friend in the policy he had adopted, and he hoped he would do as much for the cause of education in the coming year as he had done in the past year.

MR. SNOWDEN (Blackburn) who was indistinctly heard, was understood to say that they must never lose sight of the fact that it would be a very long time before any but a very small proportion of children could look to any other education than that of the elementary school. Yet they were now engaged, he understood, in building up the secondary rather than in improving the elementary school system. The scheme of the code seemed to be devoted more to the improvement of the secondary schools which were used by the richer classes than to the elementary schools which were frequented by the children of the poor. In his opinion he would be a very bold man who would maintain that the state of things was satisfactory in the elementary schools today. On looking at the papers which dealt with the number of children in the elementary schools, he found that there were 6,000,000 children of whom only 1,000,000 were above the age of twelve. He assumed from that that five out of six of the children left school under the age of twelve. [Mr. McKENNA: No, no!] Then, as to the figures in regard to secondary schools, it appeared to him, from the smallness of the numbers, that the efforts which the department had put forth in recent years in regard to the provision of secondary schools could only be taken advantage of by one child in 100. The provision of floor space in the elementary schools was 8 feet or 10 feet, but in the secondary schools, it was provided that there must be 15 feet. That was 50 per cent. more air space in the secondary school than was considered to be sufficient for the poorer children in the elementary. Then again, as to the teaching staff in the secondary school, the teacher only had under his or her charge twenty-five or thirty children, and it was specially enjoined that there should not be more than thirty-five. That regulation was not applied, however, in the case of the children in the elementary schools who were not counted as individuals at all, but simply dealt with in the lump. The regulations in regard to elementary schools were simply to the effect that the number of children in charge of the teacher must be an average number, and that average number was something like double the extreme limit permitted in the secondary schools. Then again, in regard to the grant, the difference between the elementary and the secondary school was also apparent; the maximum sum apart from that to be earned for special subjects was in elementary schools 22s., but in secondary schools it was £2 between the ages of twelve and fourteen, and between fourteen and fifteen, £5 a head. Thus children in secondary schools of the same age as those in elementary got in one case double and in another case nearly five times the amount which was considered sufficient in the elementary schools. [Mr. McKENNA: "No, no!] In regard to free places also, there was a marked distinction between elementary and secondary schools. He might be the eldest child of a large family. He had often seen parents come before the education committee of the local authority with which he was connected, and in the most shamefaced way, as if poverty was a disgrace, confess that it was impossible for their child to take advantage of the scholarship he had won. Higher education would never, therefore, be available to any extent for the children of working people, unless maintenance scholarships were provided in very large numbers. His whole protest was that, at present, considerations of caste entered far too much into the administration, not only of the local education authorities, but also of the central body. Although it might be impossible for a large number of the children of the elementary schools to take advantage of the secondary schools, much might be done by extending higher elementary teaching in the elementary schools. If opportunities were afforded to the parents to keep their children at the elementary school a little longer the difficulty might be got over by giving this teaching in the elementary school. The idea seemed, however, that elementary education had reached its maximum, and that nothing more required to be done. The new code permitted public elementary schools with not more than sixty children in attendance, to be in charge of an untrained teacher, but he contended that it was more important to have a thoroughly efficient head teacher in a small school, than in a large one, because he was so much confined. The number of uncertificated and untrained teachers in the elementary schools was increasing much more rapidly than the number of certificated teachers. At present there were 100,000 of them, and what results could any reasonable person expect from their work? There was plenty of room for revolutionising the public elementary school system by administrative methods. Local authorities were paying much more than they ought towards the cost of education, which was not a local but a national matter, and should, therefore, be made a national charge. He contended that a larger expenditure of public money for the education of the children was the best investment the country could make. He had considerable experience of children's schools, and he considered that the children had to leave school at too early an age, and, within six months after they left, they had forgotten all they had learned, except how to read and to write. The people had now the power in their hands, and, though he spoke as a democrat, he would say that the danger of ignorance under an oligarchy was not so great as that which might arise from an ignorant democracy. Therefore it was the duty of the State to give the people such an education as would enable them to use their power wisely and well. He congratulated the right hon. Gentleman on his appointment to his present position, and he hoped that when he ceased to hold office he would be able further to congratulate him on a record of really substantial work.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) said the regulations which the right hon. Gentleman had just published had excited a feeling, certainly of apprehension, if not dismay, among the people whom he and his hon. friends around him represented. As an Irish Member he fought the Bill of last year so long as he thought it unjust, and he supported it when he thought it had been so amended as to make it a fair, reasonable, and just compromise. He felt inclined to say of the two great English Parties, "A plague on both your houses." It was quite true that the Minister for Education had issued something like a declaration of war against a certain type of schools; he knew that the right hon. Gentleman did not so call it, but it was certainly so considered by the community which he represented in that House, and especially by the city, a part of which he represented. The right hon. Gentleman had gone to the utmost extent of his powers as against the other House, and he could not altogether acquit of blame the Party which had forced upon them this policy by what he regarded as an abuse of their power over the other House. What he had to deal with was the state of affairs which had been produced by what he considered the disastrous mistake of having rejected the Bill of last year. He spoke particularly for the schools and training colleges of the Catholics. What made him condemn the treatment of them more than that of others was that they deserved it less. The Catholic school was separated from other schools, not like Protestant schools from one another, but by an impassable gulf of irreconcileable doctrine. As a result the Catholics of this country and many other countries had imposed on themselves a heavy tax in order to maintain their schools and the religious teaching given in them ; and they did so with more energy and zeal because they were a small minority in the midst of a great majority. The Catholic community were not only a minority of the community, but they were the poorest minority of the population. Proportionately to their wealth the Catholic minority had subscribed more generously to their schools than any other body of people in the country. He went further and said that not merely did they subscribe more proportionately, but they subscribed more absolutely, than other bodies. He did not want to make any odious comparisons, or to offend the susceptibilities of hon. Gentlemen above the gangway with whom on this question he was in general agreement. But at the same time he hoped that they would forgive him for pointing out that the communion which they represented was a wealthy communion compared with the Catholics, who as a body were poor. He had a Return giving the amounts received from 1863 to the year 1905, and he found with regard to the Church of England schools that the amount received from voluntary subscriptions was £508,000 out of a total of £4,563,000, or one-ninth of the whole. He found also that the Wesleyan body, which also was largely well-to-do—["No"]—well, some were rich and some were poor, but there were very few rich people among the Irish Catholics in this country, certainly there were not nearly so many that were comfortable as there were among the Wesleyan Methodists. The Catholic community had subscribed voluntarily £93,549 out of a total of £409,134, or roughly about one-quarter of the whole. He wished to speak of this with special emphasis, because one of the most important of these training colleges was that of Mount Pleasant in the city of Liverpool. He thought the figures he had quoted showed that the Catholics had the courage of their religious convictions and displayed generosity and self-sacrifice, because out of their poverty they had subscribed very largely for their own schools. It was true that those schools were being treated like the schools of other communions, and the proposition which the right hon. Gentleman applied to one particular form of school must also apply to others. Under these new regulations anybody belonging to any communion whatever would have a right to demand entry into these training colleges and schools, and if they were denied entrance that school or college would first be fined and might finally be extinguished as far as the grant was concerned. The first time he heard that there was a large number of Protestants being educated in Catholic schools he at once denied the statement, but he had since found that he was wrong. As a matter of fact, there were a large number of children being educated in Catholic schools, and why were they sent to those schools ? It was because the parents of the children approved of that particular form of education which was given them. Some time ago he travelled home on board ship with a number of Mormons, and he found that a large number of their young ladies had been educated in a Catholic convent. Of course that did not affect their convictions in regard to the multiplicity of wives. The doors of Catholic schools were open wide to all comers, and anyone who knew the inner working of those schools would agree with him when he said that no attempt at proselytism had ever been proved. What would happen under these regulations ? He would take, for example, the training college at Mount Pleasant in his own constituency. Religious practices and exercises were to those in Mount Pleasant College as much a part of the education, and in some respects a more essential part of the education, given to the teachers than the secular instruction, because the fundamental principle of a Catholic school was that religion should not be a separate or isolated part of education. He was not at all overstating the Catholic ideal—and with a little change of words he believed it would also be the Protestant ideal—when he said that the training of Catholics in manhood, morality, and virtue was regarded as far away the most important part of education. They were under those regulations in this convent school at Mount Pleasant, but nevertheless they were obliged to open their doors to the Protestant child. He found no fault with that if it did not bring along with it the disqualification that the very fact of those teachers coming in would derange the whole machinery of the establishment. In a Catholic training college it was an essential part of the instruction and discipline of the school that teachers who were to go abroad to teach Catholic children Catholic doctrine and practice and ideals should be compelled, if necessary, to attend the religious exercises and devotions of the college. Under these new regulations all that would be upset. One could imagine a case where a number of Nonconformist children in a place like the West Riding of Yorkshire might possibly send so many applications for admission to a Catholic school as would change the school from its exclusively Catholic atmosphere and make it entirely undenominational and Nonconformist. These proposals were filling the people he represented with alarm and also with a strong sense of indignation. These Catholic colleges and schools had been built largely out of the pence of the poorest of the poor, and this was a poor return for the generosity they had shown in maintaining very largely these schools out of their own pockets. He thought it was very hard that they should now be penalised by the unjust regulations which the President of the Board of Education had issued.

LORD R. CECIL said there were one or two observations which he desired to make. Upon the question of training colleges he did not wish to add anything to what had been said. The question was a very serious one. He agreed with the remark that the Board of Education little knew the storm of indignation which had already been raised and which would undoubtedly go on increasing on account of the provisions which had been put into the regulations with respect to training colleges and secondary schools. He regretted that the Government had thought fit to add one more religious question to those which already encumbered the subject of education. The President of the Board of Education had said that it would not be right for him to overrule existing legislation. He was afraid the right hon. Gentleman had overlooked the fact that his regulations dealing with secondary schools did overrule existing legislation in spirit, if not in letter. Secondary schools were to receive a smaller grant unless they were put on a wholly undenominational basis. That appeared to him to be going distinctly in the teeth of two statutory provisions. The Endowed Schools Act, 1869, said that schools with a religious or denominational foundation should not be the subject of a scheme including provisions of the character of those contained in the regulations. Then there was Section 4 of the Act of 1902. It was evidently the intention of the Legislature that denominational and undenominational schools should be treated on a precise equality so far as county council assistance was concerned. In the prefatory memorandum to the new Code there was the following paragraph—

> "Questions have been asked as to whether compliance with Section 14 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870 (commonly known as the 'Cowper-Temple clause'), is at present required either by the Education Acts or by the Code to be one of the conditions fulfilled by all public elementary schools in order to obtain a Parliamentary grant. In order to make the position quite plain, the Board have inserted a provision making it a condition of annual grant that every school must comply with the regulations of the Education Acts in so far as they are applicable to the type of school in question, which, therefore, makes compliance with the 'regulation' contained in Section 14 a condition of grant."

He did not quite understand this paragraph. He remembered that a deputation of Nonconformists waited on the Minister of Education and complained of the syllabus prepared by the local education authority. This alteration was then promised in order to meet the views of the deputation.

MR. McKENNA: The noble Lord must not say that. The change was made before the deputation came.

LORD R. CECIL said he supposed the change was made before in order to mollify the wrath of the deputation. He asked the Committee to consider what the change meant. Under the existing law it was for the Courts to consider, on proper proceedings being taken, whether or not the Cowper-Temple clause had been complied with, and he understood this to be put in in order to create a concurrent jurisdiction in the Board of Education. He confessed to a considerable distrust of the view of the present Board towards the Cowper-Temple clause. As to education in

Wales, it was the duty of the Board to see that the Welsh local education authorities did not, in the exercise of their Nonconformist acerbity, so far oppress the non-provided schools as to make the teaching in those schools inefficient. He had had submitted to him a vast quantity of evidence which convinced him that that condition was not observed in a very large number of schools in Wales. It was a regular thing to have differential rates of salaries between provided and non-provided schools. In Glamorgan, not only did they differentiate between the two classes of schools, but they had actually gone so far as to reduce salaries in non-provided schools to a lower rate than was being paid before the Act of 1902. Then there was the question of under-staffing. That was another method of petty persecution. It was a regular practice of the local education authorities in certain districts of Wales deliberately and intentionally to under-staff the non-provided schools in order to starve them into submission. He would take the case of the Usk school. In 1901 they had a headmaster, an Article 68 assistant, and two trained pupil-teachers; in 1907 they had a headmaster, two supplementary teachers, and a monitor. That was a considerable reduction. In the infant school in 1901 they had a headmaster, three Article 68 teachers, one pupil-teacher, and one monitress, and in 1907 that was reduced to a headmistress and two supplementary teachers. And in more than one case they had gone on under-staffing the schools until they had been compelled by a threat, sometimes by the Board of Education itself, to deprive them of grants unless they increased the staffs. In his judgment it was the duty of law-abiding citizens to carry out the law even if they did not approve of it. One of their favourite methods was to try and seize an opportunity of getting a school declared unnecessary because for some short period of time the attendance fell below thirty. Then, of course, there was the familiar plan, sometimes, recommended in that House which consisted in insisting on repairs in order to compel the closing of a school. That had been done in Anglesey, and in many other cases. He asked the attention of the right hon. Gentleman and of the Committee to the system of petty malignity prevailing in Wales, which was a scandal to the administration of education. It did not fall on the hated Church of England; it would be bad enough if it did; but it fell on the teachers and children, and it was a perfect outrage that it should be allowed to continue. He could not conclude without pointing out to the Committee that it was not only in Wales, in the administration of elementary schools, and in the regulations which had been reported to the Committee that afternoon, but in every respect the administration being carried on by the right hon. Gentleman or under the pressure of his extreme supporters was characterised by hatred of denominationalism. This bloodless administration was nothing but the fruit of bigotry and intolerance, and it showed that the Nonconformist could be as great a bigot as the Jesuit. It appeared to him that in this matter, the undenominational majority of the House was using its power deliberately to oppress the denominations of the country, and when the country realised it, as it was beginning to realise it, it would sweep from power the present administration. He asked hon. Members opposite to consider the effect of a policy of this kind. They were in power at this moment; they were able for the moment to oppress those who held opposite opinions; but if they went on they would, without a doubt, arouse a very strong feeling of indignation against themselves, and when his Party was returned to power it would be returned with embittered feelings and supported by a section which might be as bitter as the Nonconformist section which supported the present Government, and it might be that the Treasury Bench of that day would be as little able to resist those extreme supporters as the Treasury Bench of the present day were able to resist theirs. He did not see what prospect of religious peace there was unless the Government definitely turned their backs on the policy which they were now pursuing, and based themselves on the principle, the only sound principle, that the parent should decide what the religion of his child should be, and abandoned once and for all the miserable and malignant policy which they had, in England to some extent, and still more in Wales, hitherto pursued.

Mr. McKENNA remarked that the noble Lord had used very strong language as to the education administration in Wales, and his only reply was that those observations ought to have been addressed, not so much to himself, as to the hon. Baronet opposite who represented the Board of Education when the Act of 1902 came into force. Whatever was happening in Wales now happened under his administration; there had been no jot or tittle of change. Had the noble Lord been in the last Parliament he would have known that every complaint he made now was equally capable of being made under the administration of the last Government.

Lord R. CECIL: And at the instigation of the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. McKENNA said that the noble Lord denied that what he said was right, and then said it was right because he (Mr. McKenna) instigated it. Would the noble Lord make up his mind which answer he was going to adhere to? He could assure him that whatever happened now, happened then.

Sir W. ANSON said the right hon. Gentleman had charged him with enduring the maladministration in Wales of which the noble Lord complained, but supposing it to be true, the right hon. Gentleman ought to have attempted to redress the grievance.

Mr. McKENNA said that he was making as great efforts as the hon. Baronet did in that direction.

Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) asked what the right hon. Gentleman was doing about the questions of understaffing and under-paying of teachers.

Mr. McKENNA said that he was acting according to the decisions arrived at by his predecessor, and had done nothing that that was not warranted by those decisions. As to the Roman Catholic colleges, he could not subscribe to the view of the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool, that Nonconformists would be anxious to go to denominational colleges and by means of a kind of concerted action on the part of a number of students seek to obtain admission wrongfully with the object of subverting the discipline of the college. Such fears were absolutely without foundation. The fears of the hon. Member for Blackburn that, because the Board of Education had been directing their attention to secondary education, therefore they had been neglecting elementary education, were absolutely groundless. The hon. Member had argued that elementary education was in a perilous condition because only 1,000,000 children out of the 6,000,000 who attended them remained at the elementary schools after twelve; but he had forgotten that the 6,000,000 included children from five to fourteen, and naturally, therefore, the children between twelve and fourteen would be only one-sixth of the whole. Similarly, the inferences the hon. Member had drawn from the grants made in respect of elementary school children had no relation to the facts. The fears of the hon. Member with regard to the intentions of the Board were entirely groundless. In answer to another criticism, the circular issued by the Board to the local authorities with regard to the feeding of school children was solely with the intention of inciting them to act up to the spirit of the Act. With regard to medical inspection, it was the intention of the Board, if the Bill now before Parliament passed, to establish a medical bureau, which would guide and advise the local authorities as to the nature of the work they would have to do under the Act, and he hoped that when the names were published the House would be fully satisfied.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 97; Noes, 220. (Division List No. 276.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood,RtHnSirAlex.F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George-
Beach,Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase

Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A. (Worc-
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Courthope, G. Loyd
Crean, Eugene
Duffy, William J.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gilhooly, James
Gretton, John
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Hardy,Laurence (Kent,Ashford
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hazleton, Richard
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joyce, Michael
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hon.Col.W.
Keswick, William
Kilbride, Denis
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lockwood,Rt.Hn. Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long,Rt.Hn. Walter (Dublin,S.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Meagher, Michael
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm.G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Brien,Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Pease,Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Sheffield,SirBerkeleyGeorge D.
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith,F.E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W.Mitchell- (Lanark)
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson,A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Mr. Boland and Mr. William Redmond.

NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hon.HerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,SirJ.Williams(Devonport
Benn,W.(T'w'rHamlets,S. Geo.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Boulton, A. C. F.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt. Hn. SydneyCharles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Mt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Cooper G.J.
Corbett, A.Cameron (Glasgow.)
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cowan, W. H.
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar,Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gurdon,Rt.Hn.SirW.Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey,W.E.(Derbyshire, N.E.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Holt, Richard Durning
Hudson, Walter
Idris, T. H. W.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea,Hugh Cecil(St. Pancras,E.)
Leese,Sir JosephF.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy (Essex,Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas

Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk Bg'hs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall).
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncaster
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearson, W.H.M.(Suffolk, Eye)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Price,C.E.(Edinburgh, Central)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards,T.F.(Wolverhampton
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, J. M. ((Tyneside)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset E.
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Ward,W.Dudley(Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,JohnCathcart (Orkney)
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Waterlow, D. S.
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.,)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarthen
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Whiteley, and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Original Question again proposed.

And, it being after Eleven of the clock, and objection being taken to further Proceeding, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

———

FINANCE BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

*MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) resumed his speech on the new clause which he was submitting when Progress was reported on Tuesday night. The clause was as follows—

"In addition to the deductions of one-eighth, and one-sixth allowed under Section thirty five of the Finance Act of 1894 there shall also, for the purposes of collection, be allowed the cost of insurance and a deduction for expenses of management not exceeding five per centum of the gross annual value."

The hon. Member said he first desired to refer to the sad news which caused the Prime Minister the other evening to interrupt the business of the House, and on behalf of himself and his friends he wished to say how very much they deplored the tragic manner in which a Member was suddenly taken away from them, and they deeply sympathised with the family and friends in their loss. With regard to the clause which he moved, under Schedule A. a landowner paid income-tax on the gross rental of his estate, less deductions for land tax and of one-eighth on land and one-sixth on buildings. After these deductions the rental which was left was supposed to be the rental which the landlord received. But as a matter of fact, landowners, not merely those owning thousands or hundreds of acres, but even small landowners, men owning a few acres, paid not only their fair share of taxation but more than their fair share, and largely out of proportion to their revenue from the land. To illustrate his argument, he would take three estates. On one of them the calculation was made for the years 1902 to 1907, and in that period the income-tax had been at the average rate of 12·3d. in the £; but the landlord had paid 14·8d. on his net income; that was to say, he had paid 2·5d. in the £ in excess of that which he was legally required to pay. On two other estates on which an average had been taken for nine years, the average of the income-tax for that period was 11·11d. in the £; and on one estate the landlord paid in excess 1·27d. in the £, and the other had paid in excess 2·44d. in the £; and he thought that, from those figures, one might very fairly conclude that the landlord paid an average rate of about 2d. in the £ in excess of the amount of income-tax which he ought to pay. These figures had been calculated on the bare up-keep of the estate, and no allowance whatever was made for the cost of management. He submitted that the allowance of one-sixth and one-eighth ought to be considerably increased, or else the landowner ought to be allowed to render each year an accurate account of the income of his estate and be assessed to income-tax under Schedule D., as proposed by his hon. friend the Member for Oswestry. Landowners had felt for some time past that they were suffering under a grievance, but the injustice had been brought to such a pitch by the present proposals of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that it was necessary to point out how great it was. The right hon. Gentleman's distinction between earned and unearned income introduced a further inequality, because the income of a landowner was to be considered as unearned, equally with that of shareholders of a company. But the gross profits of a company before they were assessed to income-tax were subject to deductions in respect of repairs, salaries, directors' remuneration, expenses of insurance, local rates and taxes, auditors' fees, bad debts, banking charges and allowances for depreciation of plant and machinery. All these things were deducted from the gross income of the company before it was assessed to income-tax, whereas the landowner was only allowed the deductions of one-eighth or one-sixth, and he submitted that if the landowner was to be placed in the same category as a shareholder in an industrial company, then in common fairness he ought to be allowed the same deductions from his gross income, so as to bring his net income within the same assessment. The deductions he had referred to of one eighth and one sixth were introduced into the Finance Act of 1894, but they were not adequate then, and he was quite sure they were inadequate now. Those who knew the wages paid on estates now and those which were paid thirteen years ago would be fully aware of the fact that they had increased considerably. Not only that, but repairs generally cost a good deal more now than they did thirty years ago. In asking that some additional allowance should be made for the expenses of management, he did not think he was asking for anything excessive by putting it down at 5 per cent. The shareholder of an industrial company had very little to do to earn his income, but if a landowner spent no time at all in the management of his estate and employed nobody to look after it, it would deteriorate very rapidly and that would bring ruin not only to the estate but also to those who were employed upon it. Under the Finance Act of 1894 in Clause 7, Subsection (5), it was provided that in estimating the value of an estate there should be a deduction for expenses of management not exceeding 5 per cent. of the gross annual value. It was upon that clause that he had based his new clause. He thought he had taken a very modest estimate, and he was afraid that he should be told by his hon. friends that he had placed it too low. He thought, however, by drawing up his clause on the basis of Clause 7 of the Finance Act of 1894 he was following a good precedent. In regard to insurance, industrial companies were allowed to deduct from their gross profits the cost of insurance, and he did not think he was asking too much in providing that the landowner who insured his property should be allowed to deduct the cost of the insurance. If the right hon. Gentleman considered it more feasible to add a small percentage instead of the actual cost to the deductions already allowed he would be quite willing to accept it. He submitted that in putting this new clause before the House he was only asking the Chancellor of the Exchequer to put the landowning class and the holders of shares in an industrial company upon equal terms. He begged to move.

New clause—

"In addition to the deductions of one-eighth and one-sixth allowed under Section 35 of the Finance Act of 1894, there shall also, for the purposes of collection, be allowed the cost of insurance and a deduction for expenses of management not exceeding five per centum of the gross annual value."—(*Mr. Hicks Beach.*)

Brought up and read a first time.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (MR. ASQUITH, Fife, E.) said he thought the hon. Gentleman would not be surprised when he heard that he could not possibly accept this clause. The contentions the hon. Gentleman had raised had been equally valid for the last thirteen years, during ten of which Conservative Governments had been in power.

MR. HICKS BEACH said the injustice had been accentuated by differentiating between earned and unearned incomes.

MR. ASQUITH said that was not so. Sir William Harcourt gave to the landed interest by way of partial compensation the very large concession which was now contained in Section 35 of the Act of 1894 under which for the purposes of Schedule A they were allowed the right to deduct one-eighth on land and one-sixth in regard to repairs. That was a very large percentage as compared with the state of the law which previously existed. Under this Bill investments in land and industrial companies stood precisely on the same footing as in 1894. No one was more qualified to speak for the landed interest than Lord St. Aldwyn, but he never sought to give effect to the propositions the hon. Gentleman had advanced, nor did either of his two Conservative successors. What was good enough for them was good enough for him, and he should shelter himself behind them.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) said he was afraid the tone which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had adopted would not make it easy for them to conclude this debate in a reasonable time. The right hon. Gentleman had chosen to adopt a most aggressive tone of which he was a past master, and he had proceeded by the method of *argumentum ad hominen.* The Chancellor of the Exchequer had included him in the various predecessors whose example was good enough for him. If the right hon. Gentleman would always act on that principle, his action would be good enough for him, but he was not consistent. He only pleaded the example of his predecessors when it suited him for the moment. He could not speak for his predecessors. He was himself not satisfied upon this particular point, but he deferred taking action pending the Report of a Committee which he appointed. He was not able to act on any of the recommendations of the Committee, their report coming too late for him to take action.. A certain allowance was made by the Act of 1894. That allowance was a percentage of the whole. Agricultural rates had not risen since then, but the cost of labour had. Building operations might be carried out now in towns more cheaply than thirteen years ago, but agricultural buildings could not be erected more cheaply now than then. The tendency of agricultural rates was to fall, and that of agricultural expenses to rise. Therefore, *prima facie* an allowance which was no more than adequate in 1894 was less than adequate in 1907. He thought they had arrived at a period when they ought to reconsider this matter. In recent years they had been taking away the special privileges of land, and therefore they should also take away the special disabilities. His hon. friend had shown that other forms of property were allowed deductions which were not allowed for land, and the only answer of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was that that had been going on a long time. So had the anomalies which the right hon. Gentleman had sought to remove.

He asked him to deal out even-handed justice all round. That was the minimum and the maximum of his claim.

Mr. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash) said the answer of the Chancellor of the Exchequer did not meet the argument of his hon. friend. It was not a complete answer for the right hon. Gentleman to say that he was doing what Conservative Governments had done. They did not expect an enlightened Liberal Government to do the same thing. He did not think that there was anything unfair in asking that land should be treated in exactly the same way as other forms of property. After outlays had been deducted, he thought that in most cases landlords put into their own pockets considerably less than 80 per cent. of the gross rental. What he objected to was that the present system of assessment gave a premium to the bad landlord who did not choose to spend much money on his estate. Good landlords who spent money in improving their estates should be encouraged, and he hoped that in the course of the year the Chancellor of the Exchequer would turn his attention to this anomaly with a view to land being treated in the same way as other forms of property.

*Mr. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry) said that the right hon. Gentleman had used an argument to the effect that the longer justice was delayed, the more unnecessary redress became, and he thought that if instead of sheltering himself behind previous Chancellors on that side he had followed the example of Sir William Harcourt on his own side, he would not have been able to take the line that he had taken. He had said that there was no particular reason why this grievance should be removed now more than in any previous year, but he could give him one reason for comparing this year with 1894, and that was that in both years there was a large increase in the death duties, and he believed it was largely owing to that increase that Sir William Harcourt did introduce what the right hon. Gentleman described as the very generous treatment of the landlords under the Act of 1894, as to compensation. If Sir William Harcourt had followed the argument of the right hon. Gentleman to the effect that it had gone on for a long time and therefore nothing need be done, he thought he would not have found very much support; but his argument was that, although Committees had reported in favour of this as long ago as in the sixties and nothing had been done, he thought it ought to be done in 1894. When the Committee reported in favour of this particular reduction of one-eighth and one-sixth wheat was at 60s., labour and the cost of repairs were very much less than now, and the case was in no way parallel to the present conditions. But the repairs and necessity for making repairs on estates remained exactly the same; if anything, they had increased, and where the landlord managed his property well he certainly spent more on it, and suffered more under this particular system. They had been constantly told by hon. Gentlemen opposite that landlords ought to manage their property in a more businesslike manner, but why did not the Government allow them to do so? Why not allow them to produce their accounts and pay taxes according to their net income? They were also told, especially by the Drury Lane School of Agriculture, that the best landlords were those who had the largest number of small holdings on their property. Everyone knew that the repairs on small holdings were very much more heavy than where the property was divided into large farms, and, therefore, what they were doing now was to tax the man who, they said, was doing the best for his property about twice as much as they taxed the man who, according to them, was managing his property very badly indeed. The right hon. Gentleman also said that his proposals in regard to unearned incomes did not come into the question now being discussed at all, but he begged leave to differ as to that, and he would give a concrete instance which must make it perfectly clear as it was now under the Bill. He would take two lawyers, both earning £1,200 a year. One of them enjoyed an income of £700 a year out of funds left to him, or which he had accumulated; the other one was a landed proprietor with a gross rental of £1,200, of which he netted only £700. The result of the alteration under this Bill was that the man who had £700 a year net income from land did not come below the £2,000 a year limit, and therefore did not get any relief at all, because they did not allow him to pay on his net income. But the other man did, and it worked out that, both men earning the same amount and both having the same income unearned, one of them paid £32 10s. more income-tax than the other. To say that the question of unearned income did not affect the point raised by his hon. friend was wholly inaccurate, and he thought the point in question could not have been properly understood by the Chancellor.

Lord WILLOUGHBY de ERESBY (Lincolnshire, Horncastle) said he had always understood that before the Finance Act of 1894 certain extra taxes in the way of death and succession duties were placed upon landed property, to which personalty was liable but from which real property was exempt, that real property had been so exempt, owing to the fact that land was rated, and personal property was not rated, and for the first time by the Finance Act of 1894 those duties and the whole of the duties payable on an estate at death were equalised as between landed property and personal property. Therefore, all the argument which had been used that night as regarded concessions made by the Finance Act of 1894 were brushed away by the fact that then for the first time real property was brought on the same footing as personal property. The point now before them was the fact, perfectly well known to everybody, that the deductions on real estate now allowed did not in the least cover the cost of maintenance and of management, and the Amendment of his hon. friend was to make some further allowance for the cost of management and maintenance and other outgoings. He was always pleased to quote on this question the greatest authority on finance of the last century, the late Mr. Gladstone, and anybody who read Mr. Gladstone's Budget speeches must see that he recognised the injustice that was being done to real estate as against personal estate. In his famous Budget speech of 1853, he distinctly laid down what deductions should be made for real estate for the purposes of the income-tax, and they were these: charges for repairs, building, fences, drains, etc.; secondly, insurance and law charges; thirdly, the cost of management; and fourthly, arrears of rent. The different deductions which ought to be allowed had, therefore, been laid down, and he was certain that if the Chancellor of the Exchequer were to take any estate, and take into account the deductions which Mr. Gladstone said should be allowed, he would arrive at the same conclusion as Mr. Gladstone as to the net income. The income-tax at that time was 7d. in the £, and Mr. Gladstone said that every landowner would pay not 7d. but 9d. They asked that the subject should be inquired into and that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should try to meet them in some manner. It was perhaps a perfectly fair retort for the right hon. Gentleman to say that previous Conservative Chancellors of the Exchequer had refused to move in this matter, but for himself he regretted that they had not done so. A few years ago he spoke on this subject to the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, but he was afraid that he spoke to deaf ears. He hoped, however, that the right hon. Gentleman who now occupied the position would give a more favourable consideration to his suggestion. They were not now talking of "wars and tumults of war," but were confining their attention to agricultural improvements and such like matters. They were now "in the piping times of peace," and talking about getting people back to the land, and he thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer should, in order to do justice, take these matters into account. He had heard it stated that the income derived from land was not a precarious income, and therefore if they paid a little more than other people they ought not to grumble; but those who knew anything about land knew that the income was very precarious and dependent upon whether the sun shone or the rain fell in adequate quantities. It was not so many years since the question of the taxes on land was considered by a Chancellor of the Exchequer, and a great concession was made by allowing the income of farms to be assessed under

Schedule D instead of as formerly under Schedule B. He thought that nobody could deny that it was right that the farmer should have that concession, and if the Chancellor of the Exchequer could not make any concession to them in this Budget he asked him to look into the matter himself and see if he could not do so next year. He would see that it was an undoubted fact that the income derived from lands and the income upon which the tax was paid were quite different amounts He was sure the right hon. Gentleman did not wish *sub rosa* to raise taxation.

Mr. ASQUITH said that he would of course consider the matter, and if the case was as stated, he would not be slow to do what he could to remove any grievance. What he had said was that a large concession to the land was made in 1894, and he had not heard any argument which proved that that concession was inadequate.

Mr. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford) was sure they would all welcome the second statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but they would have been wanting in their duty if they had not raised this question at the present moment. The other Chancellors of the Exchequer to whom reference had been made regarded this income-tax as an annual one, but the right hon. Gentleman now acknowledged that it must be a permanent tax. That was the difference which existed between the present condition of things and that which existed in 1894, and upon that ground alone it was certainly necessary that his hon. friend should bring it forward. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer was willing to view the matter in a favourable light, it made a great difference. The right hon. Gentleman had referred to the Act of 1894, but if the tax fell heavily upon industries in one form and another, it also fell heavily upon agriculture. No allowance was made to landlords in regard to dairy and cow-shed regulations, which involved a very large expenditure upon buildings and maintenance. Rents also had fallen, and he thought the case of the landowner demanded the favourable consideration of the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Mr. HICKS BEACH said the first speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was certainly not pleasant to those sitting on that side of the House, although his second speech was more sympathetic: There were some of them who felt that a landlord who spent a considerable time in the management of his own estate or employed a person to manage it for him did considerably more than the man who invested his money in an industrial concern and did nothing but draw his dividends. What they asked therefore was that the landlord should be put in the same position as the man who invested his money in an industrial concern. They desired that the landlord who did the work himself or employed a man to do it for him should get some allowance. A relative of his who had occupied the position of Chancellor of the Exchequer for many years was of the same opinion, and he thought that a person who was assessed under Schedule A should in common fairness be treated in the same way as to earned and unearned income as a person assessed under Schedule D.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 50; Noes, 192. (Division List No. 277.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil Lord John P. Joicey-
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gretton, John
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Renton, Major Leslie
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)

Ronaldshay, Earl of
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield,Sir Berkeley George D.
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool, Walton)
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson,A. Stanley (York, E.R.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Hicks Beach and Mr. Lane-Fox.

NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen,A. Acland (Christchurch)
Armitage, R.
Asquith,Rt.Hn. HerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker,Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Benn,SirJ.Williams (Devonport
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, J. Annan
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Buxton,Rt.Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,CH. (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cowan, W. H.
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Goddard, Daniel Frod
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth,R.L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey,W.E. (Derbyshire,N.E.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kelley, George D.
Kilbride, Denis
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea,Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras,E.
Leese,Sir JosephF.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy (Essex,Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps,Col.Ivor (South'mpton
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Price,C.E.(Edinburgh, Central)
Priestley,W.E.B. (Bradford,E)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Richards,T.F.(Wolverhampton
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradford
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. L. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw ,Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley,Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Steadman, W. C.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset E.
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Waterlow, D. S.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whiteley,John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarthen
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) said that what he proposed by his Amendment was that in calculating the duty to be paid on any estate, in regard to which reliable accounts were produced, the allowance for maintenance should be the amount which such accounts showed to have been the average annual expenditure for maintenance for the last ten years. He hoped the Committee would recognise that he asked for this concession only when reliable accounts could be produced. Those accounts would have to be supported by vouchers, and they might be inspected by any officer whom the Chancellor of the Exchequer cared to send down. How did things stand at the present moment? When an estate came up for treatment they had to depend upon the presumption that a certain percentage would be deducted, but they had no knowledge at all what that percentage would be. The Chancellor of the Exchequer would probably tell him that all these things were submitted to the reasonable discretion and fair-mindedness of the officers of the Inland Revenue, but that was not quite the same thing as the concession for which he asked. He wished especially to call the attention of the Labour representatives to this point. What was the expenditure in regard to which he desired to have these reliable accounts? In a very large degree the expenditure was incurred in the provision of cottages which would really be sanitary and a credit to the owner, and consequently those who occupied them would be substantially benefited. Another part of the expenditure would be in the promotion of all the various industries which would be encouraged by estate expenditure. This expenditure also went directly for increasing the productive capacity of the land and the fertility of the soil, and it gave those occupying the land the best possible chance of securing a remunerative return for their labour. It might be said that the proposal was not justified on strict business lines, but that only affected the position of the man who, for the time being, was spending that revenue. The community and the people at large benefited by the ownership of land being in the hands of men who made it their practice to expend money largely upon their own estates. He believed that a man who spent money in his lifetime rendered a greater service to the community than a man who accumulated wealth and bequeathed it to others at his death. He would briefly illustrate his argument by quoting figures, for the accuracy of which he could vouch. In the case of a small squire's property the gross rents received amounted in fifteen years to £62,800 in round figures. The rates, taxes, and other charges amounted in the same period to over £10,000. During the fifteen years the expenditure upon improvements and repairs had been over £23,000. That meant that in those fifteen years over 40 per cent. of the income of the estate had been spent on improvements and repairs alone. The item of outdoor wages to workers employed on the estate during the fifteen years amounted to £20,000. Therefore, when these different charges were added together and the sum deducted from the gross rental, it appeared that the expenditure amounted to over 80 per cent. of the income derived from the estate. Besides all that there had been these particular estate charges, amounting to over £1,500 a year, and they were making the ownership of that land for those fifteen years result in not only not a profit but a considerable loss. He was asking that where an estate of that sort could show those figures in a way which absolutely satisfied the most stringent critic of their correctness, those figures should be taken as the amount to be deducted from the estate's net income in order to show the real amount on which it would be fair to charge the duty. Hon. Members would recognise that the expenditure was not selfish expenditure; it was directly for the good of the countryside and for the good of the objects they all had at heart, and therefore it must be a matter of importance, to be considered favourably, that those who were willing to spend in that way should be encouraged rather than discouraged. The work was genuine; it was not nonsense work. Every penny was spent on real improvements, and on carrying out in the highest degree that which was put before them as the ideal at which owners of land ought to aim. Would it not therefore be fair that they should encourage such treatment of an estate by the owner, and as long as they absolutely safeguarded themselves from any possibility of fraud or exaggerated estimates or overdrawn statements, that they should fall in with his suggestion and say that under those circumstances they would allow that the fair deduction would be that which the estate accounts showed, so long as they were based upon the average of a sufficient number of years to make them reliable? He had suggested ten years, but if the Chancellor would rather take fifteen years, or a shorter number of years, well and good. But whatever number of years he took it should be sufficiently long to ensure the estate not losing because of the expenditure of some special sum in one particular year, and to make it certain that they were really giving a relief which had been fairly earned. He thought he had made a case which would justify the consideration of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and he would be satisfied if the right hon. Gentleman gave an assurance that if that consideration led him to the belief that such action as he suggested would be beneficial to the estate and really good for the maintenance of the system under which the country was carried on now he would endeavour another year to meet him at all events in some degree.

New clause—

"In calculating the duty to be paid on any estate, in regard to which reliable accounts are produced, the allowance for maintenance shall be the amount which such accounts show to have been the average annual expenditure for maintenance for the last ten years."—(*Colonel Kenyon-Slaney.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. ASQUITH said he was not going to complain of the manner in which the right hon. Gentleman had presented his case, and he quite agreed that there were in the present law provisions under which cases of hardship might arise, nor had he any difficulty in giving him the assurance which he asked for at the end of his speech, that this question should receive the most careful consideration. He must, however, point out again that the scale of deductions had been in force for a considerable number of years, and none of his predecessors had seen their way to increase them. No doubt an argument of that kind did not commend itself to the right hon. Gentleman, and it was, of course, not conclusive, and he was quite ready to consider the question independently of any decision of previous Chancellors of the Exchequer. He must also point out that he was assured by those responsible for the Inland Revenue that they had no hard and fast rule as to what were necessary outgoings and that they would take into account any *bona fide* expenditure incurred upon the estate during the year preceding the death of the testator. If then, there was a statutory deduction under the Act of 1894 for management not exceeding 5 per cent. and all these other considerations were taken into account, there was no unfairness, particularly when the reasonableness and elasticity which the Inland Revenue officers applied was considered. Further, the language which the hon. Member used was not such as could be put upon the Statute-book. He therefore suggested that the Amendment should be withdrawn on his assurance that he would consider this point.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY said it would be discourteous to resist the appeal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and he had no intention of doing so. He understood that the right hon. Gentleman was going to deal with this question with a fair and open mind. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would understand that if his object was attained, it would be to the advantage of the country. He would not put the Committee to the trouble of a division.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth) moved a new clause to provide that every company or corporation which was chargeable with income-tax on its profits should be assessed only in respect of such profits as were distributed among the shareholders of that company or corporation.

MR. ASQUITH said the matter had already been discussed.

*MR. FELL said he would be very short, but it was felt to be a hardship by many people that the profits of a company which were not divided among shareholders should have to pay income-tax. There was a marked discrepancy in the way in which profits were assessed. The Court of Chancery, on the one hand, declared that the profits of a company were only those which were made after the capital of the company had been maintained. The Commissioners of Inland Revenue, on the other hand, said that none of the profits of a company might be applied for the purpose of keeping capital intact, but the whole must be treated as profit and pay income-tax. He thought the Committee would agree with him that the Court of Chancery took a more sound financial view of the subject than did the Commissioners of Income-Tax. If a company was to be a permanent institution carried on for the benefit of shareholders, the first object of the directors must be to keep the capital fully maintained and to distribute only the profit which remained over and above that amount. The Commissioners of Income-Tax did not allow the deduction, and the shareholders therefore had to pay 1s. in the pound on the sum put aside for reserve. They never received that money. If they did many of them would be able to get the 1s. back, because their income would come within the limit of abatement. Under the present arrangement, however, they had no chance of getting it back, and therefore a company paid to the Income-Tax Commissioners a larger sum than really would be obtained if the money was distributed amongst the partners or shareholders of a company. That was one of the points he wished to press. There was another, namely, that the directors of a company might be relied upon to distribute as much as possible to the shareholders. He should say that they put their best foot forward in most cases, and the Courts had agreed with this, because they did not allow the shareholders to propose at the annual meeting that a larger dividend should be distributed than that which the directors themselves suggested. The clause was framed on the assumption that the directors always would distribute the very maximum sum they were justified in distributing on the profits which might be reasonably held to be made in each year, and even if they did put something aside the income-tax derived the full benefit, because it was to be supposed that the sum would be employed and, consequently, would earn further income on which income-tax had to be paid. He thought they might rest assured that the directors would always distribute as much profit as might safely be distributed, and the Income-Tax Commissioners should not tend to make the directors distribute more than they ought. It would be sounder finance, therefore, if they only charged a company the tax on the profits which the shareholders received.

New clause—

"Every company or corporation which is chargeable with income-tax on its profits shall be assessed only in respect of such profits as are distributed among the shareholders of that company or corporation."—(*Mr. Fell*).

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. ASQUITH said he was sorry the hon. Gentleman had raised this point again, because it had been discussed only a few days ago. He did not want to repeat the speech he made then, in which he dealt very fully with the arguments the hon. Gentleman had just used. He would briefly recapitulate his views. In the first place the clause sought to make a difference between a statutory company and an individual. But what was law for a company ought to be law for an individual also, and if they were going to allow a company to escape assessment for income-tax on that part of its profits which were placed to reserve the same rule must be applied to an individual. That in itself was sufficient to dispose of the clause, but, quite apart from that, it was contrary to the fundamental principles of our taxation. The tax was assessed on profits. The moment a sum was ascertained to be a profit it became chargeable to income-tax: the person who received it had nothing to do with it. It might be placed to a reserve fund, distributed in charity, or spent in reckless and riotous living—all these things were absolutely immaterial. The moment it appeared in the character of profit it was subject to the definition of the income-tax law. On these two grounds, which were fully set forth the other day, he could not assent to the clause.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN hoped his hon. friend would not proceed to a division on the clause. He could not support it in the form in which it stood, and it was perfectly true they had had a discussion on the same point, which he thought had not been wholly useless. The only further hope he would express was that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would give a little attention to the subject. What was said by his right hon. friend the Member for Dublin University first of all, and afterwards concurred in by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, was that the real question was how profits should be arrived at. He thought that as the Chancellor of the Exchequer had an open mind with regard to injustices of the income-tax, he might profitably spend a little time in examining the definition of profits, with particular reference to wasting capital. Part of the reserves were really the replacement of wasting capital. Part of them were nothing of the kind, but were additional capital placed in the business. If they were for the equalisation of dividends it might affect the Chancellor of the Exchequer's revenue in a particular year, but not in the long run, because if the revenue received too little one year, the Chancellor would get the tax whenever the reserve was utilised for the equalisation of dividends.

Mr. FELL asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. SAMUEL ROBERTS moved a new clause providing that on and after 1st January, 1908, the customs duty of 1d. per lb. on cocoa should cease to be payable. He thought in this matter he might claim the support of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, because in a former speech this session the right hon. Gentleman stated that the duty was not defensible, and moreover, it only brought in a small amount and would not interfere as the sugar duty would with the Budget. The yield in raw cocoa in 1906, amounted to £184,952, and that was the item he asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer to remit after 1st January next. This year it would only amount to £46,000, and therefore would not interfere with his Budget in any way. Cocoa was produced in the tropics only; it could not be produced in this country. It was produced in our own Possessions in the West Indies. It was an article of food and was also used in the manufacture of chocolate in this country. The Chancellor of the Exchequer on the 18th April said that this duty was a small and not very lucrative tax. The right hon. Gentleman also thought there was a good deal of the flavour of protection about it, and that it was not defensible though it was a very small affair. If it were a very small affair he asked the right hon. Gentleman to accept this clause. He simply asked the right hon. Gentleman to repeal the duty on the raw cocoa, and not on the other forms of cocoa. He thought if this country were commencing afresh its customs duties, it would not adopt the system at present followed. We were raising at the present time about £13,500,000 on articles of food imported, and which did not compete in any way with the products of this country. While doing that we allowed to come in absolutely free last year as much as £131,000,000 worth of articles wholly or mainly manufactured. Those articles competed with our own manufactures and labour.

*The CHAIRMAN said the clause did not relate to manufactures.

Mr. SAMUEL ROBERTS said he was giving a reason why it seemed to him absurd that we should adopt a system, whereby we taxed articles of food coming into this country which did not compete with what we made. He would not, of course, go further into that. The argument was used by Members on the other side of the House, including the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that they who held the views he himself did were placed on the horns of a dilemma, because if a duty were imposed and the goods still came into this country we got no protection for our manufactures; but, on the other hand, if the goods were kept out we got no duty. Here was a case which met that argument. We were receiving at the present time from manufactured cocoa, £70,616. That was just an instance where a small duty of 2d. per lb. did not prevent the manufactured goods coming into the country, but brought a revenue to the Exchequer. He did not propose to interfere with that in his clause. What he was asking the Chancellor of the Exchequer to do—and it was only a small request—was to remit the duty on raw material, which only brought in £184,000 odd last year; and, assuming that the same amount would be realised this year, it would only mean remitting the sum of £46,000. The right hon. Gentleman could easily do that, because he had a large increase recently. The clause would not interfere with the Budget or dislocate it in the slightest way, and the right hon. Gentleman by taking this step would give satisfaction to consumers of cocoa in this country. It was a temperance drink and he was quite sure the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have the support of his followers if he acceded to this request.

New clause—

"On and after the first day of January, nineteen hundred and eight, the duty of customs of one penny the pound on cocoa shall cease to be payable, and so much of The Customs Tariff Act, 1876, as refers to this duty is hereby repealed."—(*Mr. Samuel Roberts.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. ASQUITH said he did not suppose the hon. Gentleman expected that he would consent to this clause. He had said what he had to say on the subject in his Budget speech. He thought there was a slight flavour of protection in this duty, but it had passed the scrutiny of free traders so severe as Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Goschen and Sir William Harcourt. He was not sure that he did not take rather a stricter view himself than they did on the matter. In some ways he thought the duty interfered injuriously with the food of the people, but the hon. Gentleman, although he naturally minimised his proposal because it involved only £46,000, and although he had been kind enough to postpone the operation of this clause until 1st January next, did not give a reason why if the thing were injurious it ought not to be begun at once.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS said he suggested 1st January in order to give manufacturers an opportunity of getting rid of their stock.

MR. ASQUITH said he would rather give them a longer period—until 31st March. It made not very much difference to the manufacturer or consumer, but it made a good deal of difference to him, because, if he once assented to this proposal, although he would only part with £46,000 this year, it would mean a prospective loss of £200,000 in the year following, and he did not feel inclined to tie himself to that extent. Therefore, without entering into the general merits of that question or the various deductions which the hon. Gentleman was disposed to draw, he should ask the Committee to allow him to be free in this respect until the time came for the next Budget.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow) said he would have thought all the Members on the other side of the House and below the gangway would have supported this Amendment, as they were always accusing the Unionist Party of wishing to tax raw material. It seemed to him that if it were wrong to tax very slightly part of our wheat supply, it must be still more wrong to tax the whole of the raw cocoa very considerably. Cocoa, after all, was undoubtedly a food, and here was the Chancellor of the Exchequer not only taxing it heavily, but, so far as he could make out, he was to go on taxing it. Cocoa was very largely used by the very poor, and they considered it both food and drink. It was moreover very nourishing, and it had none of the disadvantages of tea and coffee. His opinion certainly was that it was used very considerably by the poorest class in Shrewsbury, and he believed it was the same in the other large towns. We could not produce it in this country, and consequently the people who bought it had to pay the whole of the tax. Why was it a terrible wrong to talk about putting on a tax of less than one-fifth of a farthing per lb. on about half the supply of wheat coming into this country, and quite right to put a 1d. a lb. on all cocoa, and another 1d. a lb. on all imported manufactured cocoa? This seemed to be breaking all the rules of what the Government were pleased to call free trade. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would excuse his saying so, but it appeared to him a particularly warm performance, seeing that the head of one of the largest cocoa manufacturers in this country was reported to have given to the Liberal Party £20,000 for the last general election. He thought that gentleman was very wise in his generation; he got a tariff himself, and he was going to take thundering good care no one else got it. Liberals said they must stick to free trade in order to keep politics pure. He hoped they would take this matter into their consideration. The Government might at least have taken off the duty on the raw cocoa that came from the Colonies. Surely by so doing they would have got nearer to real free trade. It would not have cost the Chancellor of the Exchequer a very large sum, and they could hardly have been accused of making any sort of use of what he believed the Prime Minister called squalid bargains.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 36; Noes, 170. (Division List, No. 278.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn.SirAlex. F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Courthope, G. Loyd
Duffy, William J.
Fell, Arthur
Forster, Henry William
Gretton, John
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hunt, Rowland
Lockwood, Rt.Hn Lt.-Col.A.R.
Macdonald, J. R (Leicester)
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm.G. (Petersfield)
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield,Sir BerkeleyGeorgeD.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Summerbell, T.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Samuel Roberts and Mr. Claude Hay.

NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen,A.Acland (Christchurch)
Armitage, R.
Asquith,Rt.Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker,Joseph A.(Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bennett, E. H.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, J. Annan
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Buxton,Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C H(Sussex, E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cowan, W. H.
Crean, Eugene
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gill, A. H.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey,W.E.(Derbyshire, N.E.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Kelley, George D.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea,Hugh Cecil(St.Pancras, E.)
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A.Levy(Essex,Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.

Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Nicholls, George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mp'n
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott, A H (Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walsh, Stephen
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E (Clackmannan
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Mr. H. H. MARKS moved a new clause to ensure, first, that payments should be made under the Workmen's Compensation Act without deductions, and, secondly, so far as one could ensure it, that income-tax should not be paid in respect of those portions of a person's receipts which he had to part with by reason of the enactments of the Workmen's Compensation Act. Under the original Income-Tax Act of 1799 taxpayers made a general return, and it was within the knowledge of the Committee that some important changes had taken place since that time. Under the original system the income-tax payer deducted from the total income the statutory exceptions, and thus arrived at the chargeable income upon which he had to pay the tax. Since then the process had been changed, and the tax was now deducted in the course of business. Under the Act of 1799 the taxpayer returned his income after deducting from it any sum paid by way of annual interest. Thus, if his income were £1,000 and he paid away £100 in interest or annuity he returned only £900 as chargeable for income-tax. Under the present system he returned £1,000, but he had paid the £100 less income-tax, and he had therefore got the £5 tax on the £100 in hand. He paid the same amount under the new system as under the old, and the principle was the same, namely, that he was not charged on what was not his income. But let them take the case of a man who under the Workmen's Compensation Act paid £200 or £300 in compensation. Either he had to deduct income-tax, in which event the recipient suffered, or if he did not deduct the tax he himself had to pay it. The Chancellor of the Exchequer shook his head, but if he was under a misapprehension on the point he hoped he would be corrected. The point, however, was not entirely clear, and was of sufficient importance to justify elucidation, and with that object he moved the clause.

New clause—

"(1) It shall be lawful for any employer, within the meaning of The Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906, in estimating the amount at which he is chargeable for income-tax, to deduct therefrom any payments made by him during the year preceding the year in respect of which he is assessed—(*a*) by way of compensation to any person under The Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906; or (*b*) by way of premium in respect of any policy of insurance against liability under the said Act; or (*c*) by way of contribution to any scheme of compensation benefit or insurance duly certified by the Registrar of Friendly Societies under the said Act. (2) In making payment to any person of any money payable to him as compensation under The Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906, the payer shall not deduct income-tax."—(*Mr. H. H. Marks.*)—

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

*MR. ASQUITH could not help thinking the hon. Gentleman was under some misapprehension. If an employer engaged in a business paid compensation to a workman or premium on insurance against liability to pay such compensation, that would be treated as part of the expenses of the business, and would be deducted before arriving at the assessable profits. That was the law as it now stood. This clause, therefore, was not necessary.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer if there were any words in any Act of Parliament which carried out what the right hon. Gentleman had said, or whether it was merely a question of practice. All that was desired was that it should be in black and white on the Statute-book.

*MR. ASQUITH said the law with regard to deductions of income-tax was very peculiar in this respect. What the Statute did was to prohibit certain deductions from being made; it did not enumerate the deductions which were allowed. It had been the uniform practice to have regard to these prohibitions and to treat as not prohibited, and therefore allowable, all expenses which were reasonably incident to a business before arriving at the profit, and these payments had always been included as allowable deductions under the Act.

MR. H. H. MARKS said in view of the important statement of the right hon. Gentleman he would ask leave to withdraw the clause.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*SIR A. SPICER (Hackney, Central) moved a new clause relating to deductions by clergymen or ministers of religion in respect of dwellinghouses in certain cases. He said he desired to ask that clergymen and ministers of religion should be placed in the same position as medical men, who were allowed to make a deduction for the value of their consulting rooms. Ministers and clergymen were allowed under the Act of 1853 for some years in some parts of the country to make these deductions, but in recent years they had not been allowed to make them because they could not always show that their studies were wholly and exclusively used for the purpose of carrying on their profession, and in one or two cases where it had been shown that a Minister's golf clubs, for instance, had been kept in his study—

MR. ASQUITH (interrupting) said he would agree to the clause. The principle, he thought, was quite right, but the clause would require reconstruction on Report.

New clause—

"Nothing in the Income tax Acts or the schedules thereto contained shall restrain any clergyman or minister of religion who shall rent a dwelling house, a part whereof shall be used by him mainly and substantially for the purposes of any profession or office, by the said Acts or schedules charged, from deducting or setting off from the stipend, salary, emoluments, fees, or profits of his profession or office, such sum not exceeding one-eighth part of the rent *bona fide* paid for such dwelling house, with the appurtenances, as the Commissioners shall on due consideration allow, and the Commissioners shall have authority to allow such deductions as in other cases, and to assess such persons accordingly.' "—(*Sir A. Spicer.*)—

Brought up, and read a first and second time, and added to the Bill.

MR. CLAUDE HAY asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the declaration he had just made covered the point in the clause standing in his name relating to the deduction of income-tax and compensation under the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906.

MR. ASQUITH said he did not exactly know the object of the clause.

MR. CLAUDE HAY said the idea of the clause was that it was quite possible that a workman might receive by way of compensation a sum of money which, together with other sources of income, might necessitate his having to pay at the rate of unearned income upon the amount he received as compensation.

New clause—

"It shall be lawful for any person, in estimating the amount of which he is chargeable for income-tax, to deduct therefrom any sums received by him during the year preceding the year in respect of which he is assessed (*a*) As compensation under the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906, for any injury to himself or to any person on whom he was dependent within the meaning of the Act; or (*b*) Arising out of the investment or application of any sum paid or awarded to him as compensation under the said Act."—(*Mr. Claude Hay.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. ASQUITH said the sum received as compensation would not be treated as profit. The second part of the clause was, of course, another matter.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. CLAUDE HAY moved to make the stamp duty upon a policy of sea insurance one penny. He said this was a clause which ought to meet with the warmest sympathy from the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

New clause—

"The stamp duty upon a policy of sea insurance for or upon any voyage shall be one penny."—(*Mr. Claude Hay.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. ASQUITH said there were several other Amendments to the same effect. He agreed that the present scale of stamp duties on policies of marine insurance was not defensible and ought to be altered. The question was, however, rather a complicated one. The only reason he had not produced a clause as he had intended was that there was a Committee considering the whole question of indemnity for loss, particularly in case of war, and he thought it was desirable to have their Report before finally bringing the Government proposals before Parliament. The hon. Gentleman might, therefore, be quite sure that the matter would be dealt with next year. He was entirely in sympathy with his object.

MR. CLAUDE HAY said that after what had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman, in which he gathered that he pledged himself to deal with this matter substantially next year so that marine insurance might be relieved of its present onerous condition, he certainly would not press his Amendment, and he hoped next year there would be a very important step forward in marine insurance.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he understood, from private communications, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would accept the clause standing in his name, and therefore he moved it with no explanation.

New clause—

"Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in Section 10 of the Revenue Act, 1883, and subject to the conditions there set forth, gold and silver plate imported into Great Britain or Ireland may be delivered into the hands of the officers of any assay office selected by the importer though it be not the assay office nearest to the port of importation, and may, upon security being given to the satisfaction of the Commissioners of Customs, be removed to the assay office without being in charge of an officer of customs."—(*Mr. Austen Chamberlain*).

Brought up, and read a first and second time, and added to the Bill.

MR. H. H. MARKS moved a new clause to make stamp duties on insurance policies where the premium did not exceed £5 one penny. He said he moved the clause *pro forma* in order to give the Chancellor of the Exchequer an opportunity of stating definitely his position in regard to a point discussed at an earlier stage.

MR. ASQUITH said he would try to meet the hon. Gentleman. He did not want to go into details. He thought they might be a bit more generous than they were in this matter, and therefore he would be prepared to accept a penny stamp where the premium paid did not exceed £2. That was a very substantial consideration and would cover the case of those who were poor.

Mr. H. H. MARKS said he would gladly accept the suggestion and would move the clause in the new form.

New clause—

"The stamp duty on any policy of insurance, or indemnity against liability incurred by employers in consequence of claims, or possible claims, upon them by workmen who have sustained personal injury, where the premium paid does not exceed two pounds, shall be one penny."—(*Mr. H. H. Marks.*)

Brought up, and read a first and second time, and added to the Bill.

Mr. FELL, who had a new clause on the Paper with respect to the abolition of duty on sugar from the Colonies, said it was so important and would require so much discussion that he did not propose to move it at that hour of the night.

*Mr. BRIDGEMAN said he did not want to detain the Committee, but he would like to appeal to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to consider the Question raised in the clause standing in his name. In the second answer which the right hon. Gentleman gave on the Amendment of the hon. Member for Tewkesbury——

*The CHAIRMAN said he was afraid he could not allow this irregular discussion. He must have a Motion before him.

*Mr. BRIDGEMAN said he was moving his clause, and if the right hon. Gentleman would consider the point he would not trouble the House with any long speech. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would look into the whole question and enquire as to how seriously the landlords of poor agricultural land were affected by the present system, and try to do something to meet it another year, in which case he would be quite satisfied.

New clause—

"It shall be lawful for any persons owning land and hereditaments to elect to be assessed to the duties of income-tax, chargeable under Schedule D, and in accordance with the rules of that Schedule, in lieu of assessment to the duties under Schedule A. The election of such person shall be signified by notice in writing delivered personally or sent by post in a registered letter to the surveyor of taxes for the district within two calendar months after the commencement of the year of assessment; and from and after the receipt of such notice the charge upon him to the duties of income-tax for such year shall be under Schedule D, and the profits and gains arising to him from the ownership of the lands shall for all purposes be deemed to be profits or gains of a trade chargeable under that schedule."—(*Mr. Bridgeman.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. ASQUITH said he had already promised that this matter should receive full consideration.

Mr. BRIDGEMAN asked leave to withdraw the clause.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. RAWLINSON moved a new clause to add the incomes of husband and wife together and divide them by two for ascertaining the exemption or abatement of income-tax. He said the matter was brought to the notice of the Chancellor of the Exchequer last year. The point was that where husband and wife were living together their incomes should be taken as that of separate people and not of one person. In the case of a husband with £500 a year, and a wife with £300 a year, if they had remained single both would have been entitled to exemption, but being married their joint incomes came to £800 a year.

New clause—

"Incomes of husband and wife shall be added together and divided by two for the purpose of ascertaining the exemption from or abatement of income-tax to which they are respectively entitled."—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. ASQUITH said he must give the same answer that was given by every Chancellor of the Exchequer. The theory of the law was that where two persons became domestic partners they became members of one household and their two incomes were fused together. Such a change as that proposed in this clause would involve the Revenue in a loss of most enormous magnitude.

MR. RAWLINSON said he would bring the matter forward on some other occasion.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Bill reported.

Bill re-committed in respect of an Amendment to Clause 16.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

FINANCE (RE-COMMITTED) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 13, at the end, to insert the words 'Provided that if in any year owing to any alteration in the rate of duties the rate of any such duty is higher than the rate in force at the commencement of this Act, and the proceeds of that duty in that year as so calculated are less than the average proceeds of the duty for the three years ending the thirty-first day of March, nineteen hundred and seven, the proceeds of the duty instead of being calculated as aforesaid shall be deemed to be the amount of those average proceeds, and the Commissioners of Inland Revenue shall give their certificates as to the sums ascertained to be the proceeds of those duties accordingly.' "—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Motion made, and Question, "That those words be there inserted,"—put, and agreed to.

Bill reported.

As amended in Committee, and on recommittal, to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 275.]

LIGHTS ON VEHICLES BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

Mr. Asquith.

Amendments proposed, and agreed to without discussion—

"In page 2, line 3, after the word 'pounds' to add the words 'Provided that no person charged with an offence under this Act shall be convicted thereof if he proves to the satisfaction of the Court that such offence arose through the neglect or default of some other person whose duty it was to provide such a lamp as is mentioned in the foregoing sub-sections.' "—(*Mr. Gill.*)

"In page 2, line 24, at the end to add the words '(5) The Mersey Docks and Harbour Board shall as respects the area under their control have the same power to make an order of exemption under this section as the council of a borough have as respects their borough, and the powers of the council of a borough under this section shall not extend to any part of the borough which is situated within that area. In the application of this section to the area under the control of the Board, the Board shall be substituted for the council of the borough and the funds at the disposal of the Board for the borough fund or rate.' "—(*Mr. Austin Taylor*).

"In page 2, line 34, to leave out the words 'or wagon drawn by the locomotive.' "—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

"In page 2, line 37, after '1898,' to insert the words 'or wagon drawn by that locomotive.' "—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

"In page 2, line 38, at the end to insert the words '(e) any vehicle carrying farm produce to stack or barn during the months of August, September, and October.' "—(*Major Renton.*)

"In page 3, line 4, after the word 'thereunder,' to insert the words 'by a local authority'; line 5, after the first word 'shall,' to insert the words 'so far as respects vehicles to which this Act applies'; line 8, at the end, to insert the words '(4) this Act shall apply to vehicles in the public service of the Crown, subject to any exceptions which His Majesty may make by Order in Council in the interests of the naval or military service of the Crown, and in the case of any such vehicle the person whom the Department in whose service the vehicle is used names as the person actually responsible shall be deemed for the purposes of this Act to be the person who causes or permits the vehicle to be in any street, highway or road.' "—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

"In page 3, line 9, to leave out subsection (4)."—(*Mr. Watt.*)

Bill read the third time, and passed.

And, it being after half-past Eleven of the clock, on Thursday evening, Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 12th July, 1907.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—City of London (Union of Parishes) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

Great Northern and City Railway Bill. Lords' Amendment considered, and agreed to.

Great Central Railway Bill; Rawtenstall Corporation Bill. Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Pontypridd Urban District Council Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

United Methodist Church Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

PETITIONS.

NEWFOUNDLAND FISHERIES.

Petition from Birmingham, for inquiry; to lie upon the Table.

VIVISECTION (PROHIBITION).

Petition from Manchester and other places, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION (IMPERIAL COLLEGE CHARTER).

Copy presented, of the Charter of Incorporation of the Imperial College of Science and Technology [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

COMPANIES (WINDING-UP).

Copy presented, of Sixteenth General Annual Report by the Board of Trade [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 248.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Belfast Harbour Trust.

Mr. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is in a position to furnish the names of the present members of the Belfast Harbour Trust, indicating those elected and those co-opted, with the number of votes recorded for each elected member; the date of last election; the number of voters then on the register and the total number of votes then recorded; and a list of the officials employed by the Trust and the salary paid to each, and the amount paid in weekly wages and the number of persons receiving such wages.

Mr. DEVLIN: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the Belfast Harbour Commissioners invariably co-opt gentlemen on their Board who have no practical experience of nor enterprise in shipping or port work; whether the co-option takes place at peculiar times and under peculiar circumstances; whether he is aware of cases in which the retirement of Commissioners is held over by the chairman for months until the members are able to elect friends of their own; that friction has been going on for years past between the Harbour Trust and its employees; and whether, in view of the condition of affairs and the threatened destruction of the chief industry of Belfast, he will consult with the Prime Minister with a view to facilitating the passage through the House of the Harbour Authorities Bill, which is now awaiting its Second Reading.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

MR. DEVLIN: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the statements made by the right hon. Alexander Carlisle, managing director of the firm of Harland and Wolff, shipbuilders, of Belfast, on 27th June last, in that city, to the effect that during the past six months his firm had to refuse to tender for ships for the Anglo-American Oil Company, which would not have been the case if the Harbour Board had given them the ground they required; that the Trust had allowed not only the docks to silt up, and that in some cases the firm had difficulty in getting the Commissioners to remove the silt prior to the launching of large ships; that Messrs. Harland and Wolff were obliged to purchase in Germany a new floating crane, as the Harbour Commissioners refused to get one which would enable the firm to put the boilers and engines on board the new Holland-American liner at present building; that in 1906 the Harbour Commissioners refused to consider the erection of a crane, or to allow Messrs. Harland and Wolff to get one for themselves; and that when Messrs. Harland and Wolff offered to take £30,000 worth of harbour stock to enable the Trust to carry out improvements they refused to consider the offer; and whether, in view of these facts, he will order an immediate official inquiry into the whole question of the working and constitution of the Belfast Harbour Trust.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I have sent copies of these three Questions to the Belfast Harbour Commissioners and have received a reply, of which I am sending a copy to the hon. Member. I have addressed a further inquiry to the Commissioners on one or two points not covered by their letter, to which I have not yet received a reply. Until the Harbour Authorities (Ireland) Bill is printed and circulated I cannot say how far the proposals contained therein would meet with the support of the Board of Trade.

Irish Evicted Tenants—Application of James Meade of Ardee.

MR. PATRICK WHITE (Meath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether James Meade, at present residing at Irish Street, Ardee, has applied to the Estates Commissioners to be reinstated in his former holdings; and, if so, what action has been taken in his case.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have investigated James Meade's applications for reinstatement, and have decided to take no action in respect of the holding on Captain Taylor's estate, and to consider the application as regards the Ruxton Estate in connection with the sale of the entire estate.

Irish Evicted Tenants—Application of Michael Tiernan of Woodmill.

MR. PATRICK WHITE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether Michael Tiernan, at present residing at Woodmill, Townley Hall, has applied to the Estates Commissioners to be reinstated in two holdings from which he was evicted; and, if so, what action has been taken in his case.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have inquired into Michael Tiernan's application for reinstatement, and have decided to take no action as regards the claim to the holding on Miss Coddington's Estate, and to deal with the application in respect of the Balfour Estate in connection with the sale of that estate.

Anglo-Portuguese Convention of 1890.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): To ask the Secretary of of State for Foreign Affairs if his attention has been called to a treaty between England and Portugal, published in O Commercio do Porto of 31 Aosto 1890, in Article X., providing for protection of missionaries, and XI. for protection of Natives and suppression of slavery; if he will furnish a translation of the said articles; if he has received a Report from Mr. Burtt on the labour question of St. Thomé and Angola; and whether such Reports establish the fact that slavery exists in both districts for the production of rum and cocoa.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) I presume that the hon. Member refers to the convention between Great Britain and Portugal, which was signed on 20th August, 1890. As, however, it has never been ratified its stipulations have of course no force, and in any case Article XI. contains no specific provision relating to the protection of Natives. A translation of the whole document was laid before Parliament in Parliamentary Paper, Africa, No. 2, 1890–91, together with correspondence showing why the ratifications were never exchanged. A Report on the labour question at St. Thomé and Angola by Mr. Burtt has been sent to the Foreign Office. It is of a confidential nature, but His Majesty's Government have expressed their willingness to bring it before the Portuguese Government for their information if they are authorised to do so by those who are responsible for the Report.

Superannuation of Scottish Fishery Board Officials.

MR. LAMONT (Buteshire): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he is aware that the Fishery Board has now unanimously agreed to a scheme of superannuation for both officers and men of the fishery cruisers, and that this scheme cannot be put into operation until the Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Application of Penalties Bill shall have received the Royal Assent; and whether, therefore, in view of the urgency of this measure in the interests of fishery officers and men, he will endeavour to accelerate its passage into law by taking the Second Reading at an early date.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I have received the scheme of superannuation from the Fishery Board and will give it careful consideration. Its acceptance does not necessarily depend on the passage through Parliament of the Application of Penalties Bill, but I am conscious of the importance of this measure and hope to take the Second Reading on an early day.

Invention of Caps for Armour-Piercing Shells.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the departmental records relating to the introduction into His Majesty's Service of caps for armour-piercing projectiles have yet been amended so as to disclose the fact that this invention originated with Captain, now Lieutenant-Colonel, English.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The records of the department contain full particulars relating to this matter.

Frozen Meat for Militia Battalions.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether any Militia battalion now out for training is being fed on frozen beef; and, if so, whether in view of the paragraph in the Supply Handbook for the Army Service Corps which states that frozen beef is at present excluded from the contract, as it is considered that the process of thawing the meat, which is essential before consumption, renders it unnutritous, he will take steps to secure that Militia officers sent to attend supply courses shall not find that the rules they are there taught are ignored by the authorities.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Frozen beef is being admitted on two days a week under present Army meat contracts. The instructions in the Supply Handbook, published in 1899, are now under revision. The improved conditions under which frozen meat is imported have justified experts in changing their opinion as to the nutritive value of such meat.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) rose to move that a letter published that morning in the public Press, purporting to be signed by one of the hon. Members for St. Pancras, constituted a breach of the privileges of the House. He asked if it would be proper to have the letter read at the Table or would it be more convenient if he read it himself.

*MR. SPEAKER: If the noble Lord will take this course I shall be much obliged. My attention has only within the last few minutes been called to the letter to which he refers, and I do not think the hon. Member who wrote it is in his place. For the convenience of the House, therefore, it would be more suitable if the noble Lord would make his Motion on Monday when the House meets. This case would not be prejudiced in any way by the delay.

LORD R. CECIL said he would certainly take that course if it was understood that the matter would be considered on Monday as if it had been considered that day.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE, KING'S BENCH DIVISION (ADDITIONAL JUDGE).

*THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir JOHN WALTON, Leeds, S.) moved, "That an humble address be presented to His Majesty representing that the state of business in the High Court of Justice is such as to require the appointment of an additional Judge, and praying that His Majesty will be graciously pleased to appoint a new Judge of the said High Court in King's Bench Division thereof, in pursuance of the 18th Section of the Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876." He said that he invited the House to present an Address to His Majesty asking him to add another member to the judicial staff of the King's Bench Division in this country. In adopting that course, he followed the procedure which was indicated by the eighteenth section of the Judicature Act of 1876. The condition then indicated which justified and necessitated the appointment of an additional judge had, in the opinion of the Government, arisen, and it therefore became their duty to see that the necessary strength of the judicial staff was effected by the means which the section provided. Perhaps the House would allow him for a moment to call attention to the nature of the provisions in accordance with which this proceeding had been adopted. By the Judicature Act of 1876 three Judges were taken away from the King's Bench Division and transferred to the Council of Appeal. It was anticipated that the King's Bench Division might be incommoded by that loss of judicial strength; and it was also anticipated that to some extent that state of things might be met by the Judges who had become Judges of the Court of Appeal being still able to discharge the duties of the position which they formerly filled. That anticipation, however, had been entirely defeated. It was now some years since any Judges of the Court of Appeal had been able to assist the King's Bench Division in the discharge of their duties. The section then provided that if it should turn out that the loss of those three Judges in the King's Bench Division caused the business with which that Division dealt to fall into arrear, the case should be met by the appointment of new Judges, and there was power for the Crown, on Addresses from both Houses of Parliament, to appoint two new Judges to fill the three vacancies created by that Act. In conferring this power great solicitude was shown to protect the Revenue. The two Judges were not to be appointed until there were four vacancies on the judicial staff arising owing to the death or resignation of the paid members of the Privy Council. When two paid members of the Privy Council either died or resigned, one new Judge might be appointed, and when two others died or resigned, the second Judge might be appointed. This House, in 1899, acting under the powers of this section, presented an Address which led to the appointment of a new Judge of the Chancery Division. Therefore, from 1876 up to the present day no step whatever had been taken to repair the loss which the King's Bench Division suffered by the transfer of Judges to the Court of Appeal, and the view which he asked the House to adopt was that the business of the Division made it necessary that the loss of judicial strength should now be repaired. He would like to state what was his view of the state of the business in the King's Bench Division. He thought it certainly demonstrable that for some years past they had not been able to deal satisfactorily with the business before them. He thought there was a universal consensus of opinion on that point. He noticed that the Bar Council, which in such a matter was quite competent to express a well-informed and reliable opinion, suggested that there should be three new Judges added to the King's Bench Division. He had had taken out figures for the last twelve years representing the number of untried causes in that Division when the Courts had risen for the Long Vacation, and he thought that statistic was important for two reasons. In the first place it showed what at that period of the year was the number of cases which for some time had been on the lists of the Courts awaiting trial, because having ascertained what that period had been, they had to add to it some three or four months, representing the duration of the long vacation, and that would show what was the extent of the delay to which the suitors in that Division had been subjected. From 1895 to 1906 he found that the average number of cases which had been left by the Courts untried over the Long Vacation had been in each year 545, so that over the Long Vacation when the Courts rose in each of those years, there were 545 suitors who had their causes entered and were suffering all the pains of the law's delay. Assuming that these suitors had their cases entered for periods of three or four months, and he did not think that was overstating the case, and adding the Long Vacation to that period, and remembering that in that large number of cases litigants who were entitled to a speedy trial had to wait for eight or nine months, he thought there was ample justification for the strengthening of the judicial staff.

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) asked the Attorney-General whether he would give them figures showing the progression of the average he had put before them.

*SIR JOHN WALTON replied that he gathered that in 1895 there were 424 untried causes held over the long vacation, in 1896 642, in 1897 745, in 1898 294 (an exceptionally low year), in 1899 488, in 1900 501, in 1901 575, in 1902 485, in 1903 561, in 1904 621, in 1905 579, and last year 631, while in the present year, although they had not yet reached the long vacation, and there might be additional cases entered between now and then, the number of causes and matters entered for trial was 560 the number of actual causes being 462, plus some ninety Crown paper cases and eight bankruptcy cases, so that the present year might be taken as fairly about the average for that considerable period of time. This comparison indicated a chronic state of things, a state of things which had existed for some twelve years, and a state of things the evils of which appeared to be progressive. What ought they to expect, taking the year 1899 as a starting point and tracing the history of litigation down to the present day? Commerce was growing, the population was increasing, business got heavier and more intricate, and the litigation to which it gave rise was of greater complexity. The industry of the country was growing, and they therefore expected growth in the demands of the population upon the Courts of Justice to deal with disputes to which such a state of things must inevitably give rise. In 1899, when this subject was discussed by Parliament, the state of the Courts as it then existed was stated in very dark colours by the various Members who took part in the debate. The House would, perhaps, pardon him if he made a quotation from his own speech on that occasion, because he was at that time actively engaged himself in the King's Bench Division and could speak with personal experience. In that speech he stated that—

> "the difficulties in the Queen's Bench Division were scarcely less grave than in the Chancery Division. The Queen's Bench Division had more than once come to the assistance of the other Courts, and the result had been that at this moment the Queen's Bench Division was in a condition which had scarcely any parallel, at all events in recent experience and history, and the addition of the metropolitan Courts indicated a complete collapse of the machinery of the Queen's Bench Division."

Nothing had been done from that time to this, and the question arose as to how they were to deal with the situation. He would first of all like to point out the dangers which they were under and which those who were not personally familiar with the business of the Courts were under, of having the edge of criticism blunted by the spirit of judicial optimism which seemed to grow up after a few years of experience on the part of members of the Bench. He read the other day a statement by one of the most respected Judges, who intimated that he thought, on the whole, the situation was not unsatisfactory, because generally after the lapse of a few months a litigant got his case tried. But it was the lapse of these few months of which they were complaining, and which involved what was practically a denial of justice. It was the power of commanding that delay which could be exercised by a wealthy litigant who refused to pay a just debt of which they complained. It was that state of business which allowed a person who had sustained some injury, and was absolutely entitled to compensation, to have his remedy postponed until the verdict he obtained was stale and worthless. He could not conceive of a greater evil attendant upon any judicial system. There was another consequence which was not immaterial. The delay in the disposal of business in the Courts led to irregular and unsatisfactory arrangements in matters that ought to be judicially determined. There were arbitrations, the results of which were rarely satisfactory to the parties, and were only less unsatisfactory to the man who won than to the man who lost. Then there were what were called compromises, a euphemistic description. This was another process for cutting a knot which the parties were entitled to have properly untied by judicial decision. But the process of having it unravelled by law was so intolerably slow and tedious that zealous counsel came to the relief of their clients and obtained the best terms they could by compromise, because they felt that the terms, however disastrous, would be less disastrous than the process of litigating the dispute. He said this was a very unsatisfactory condition of things, and he asked the House to consider what was the remedy. He did not say that the appointment of another Judge was the only remedy. There were concurrent remedies. The appointment of another Judge was at all events an essential measure, because the primary mode of dealing with the delay in the trial of causes was to ensure that the judicial staff was numerous enough and strong enough to cope with the business that was brought before it. In this matter they had had some experience. The commercial causes before the Courts were put into a separate category and assigned to a separate Judge, and all technical proceedings were abolished as they came forward at an earlier stage. By that arrangement judicial machinery adequate to deal quickly with its particular business was created; and the result had been entirely satisfactory to the commercial classes. In 1899 the House decided that the Chancery Division was hopelessly blocked. He supposed that upon that occasion there were lawyers in this House who might have criticised the action of the Judges. There might have been lawyers who said that the appointments of the Chancery Judges were political appointments. [AN HON. MEMBER: It would not have been true.] That was so. There might have been those who would have said that it was the *personnel* of the Bench which was objected to, but nobody resorted to that argument, which he thought would have been unjust and unchivalrous, A Chancery Judge was a man of experience and ability in the same way as was a Judge of the King's Bench Division. They had to take things as they found them, and taking things as they existed in 1899 the House came to the conclusion that the Chancery Division was blocked, and that that block might be removed by another Judge being appointed. Another Judge was appointed, the block was removed, and business was transacted with despatch, to the satisfaction of the country. There was no reason to doubt that a similar step taken in the case of the King's Bench Division would be attended by a similar result. Two Amendments to his Motion appeared on the Paper. The noble Lord the Member for East Marylebone desired the appointment of three Judges. Those who wanted to go further could hardly decline to go as far as the Motion asked them to go. The other Amendment stood in the name of his hon. and learned friend the Member for Cambridge, who made a very effective and strong criticism upon the constitution of the judicial Bench a short time ago, and he invited an inquiry into the present working of the King's Bench Division before an additional Judge was appointed. He had no objection to inquiry, and by all means let there be one; but if, as he thought, there was good reason for the appointment of another Judge, the step would not be final. There was a Committee sitting to consider the state of business in the Courts; and if they made proposals for the distribution of business which involved a reduction in the judicial staff necessary to deal with it, there would be no necessity to appoint a successor to the new Judge. He could present the existing necessity for an additional Judge to the House in a vivid form. He was most anxious that when the King's Bench Division rose at the end of the present month there should not be more than 100 causes untried. Having obtained the necessary authority from the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Lord Chancellor, he approached the Lord Chief Justice with a proposal that Commissioners should go on circuit in a sufficient number and that the Judges, who alone could sit in London, should remain in London to try the causes. The Lord Chief Justice promised to use his influence. In the result, however, he found it impossible to interfere, but he said that if he could have another Judge, and have him promptly, he thought he should be able to clear off the lists before the Courts rose. Unfortunately that anticipation had not been even realised, for the number of causes awaiting trial at the end of this month would be scarcely fewer than the number at the corresponding period in other years. It would have been easy for the Government to let things slide, to allow the block in the Courts to go on for an indefinite period. But they recognised that one of the primary duties of a Government was to see that the Courts were not only opened, but that those who entered them should have speedy justice. It would have been a cowardly act if the Government had hesitated to make this proposal. They made it with reluctance, for they did not desire to add to the public burdens, but they felt that duty called upon them to fulfil this obligation, and in that spirit they asked the House to accept the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty representing that the state of business in the High Court of Justice is such as to require the appointment of an Additional Judge, and praying that His Majesty will be graciously pleased to appoint a new Judge of the said High Court in the King's Bench Division thereof, in pursuance of the eighteenth section of The Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876."—(*The Attorney-General.*)

*MR. SPEAKER said the Amendment on the Paper in the name of the hon. Member for Cambridge—to leave out all after "That," and add, "this House, while ready to support any increase in the number of Judges in the King's Bench Division necessary for the due despatch of business, desires inquiry into the present working of the Division before requesting any additional appointment"—was a reasoned negative, and the Motion could only be met by a direct negative.

*MR. BUCKMASTER (Cambridge) said that for the reasons which were indicated in the terms of the Amendment, which he understood was not strictly in order, he felt himself unable to agree with the Motion which the learned Attorney-General had made. That the condition of affairs in the King's Bench Division were such as to require a prompt and effective remedy no man who was acquainted with the subject could deny. There could be no doubt that the lists were positively groaning with the load of untried cases, and each day added to the weight of the burden which they had to bear. Nor would any details of figures nor any array of statistics convey an adequate idea of the mischief which such a state of things involved. For every untried case there was some wretched suitor who beyond the unavoidable distress and worry of a law-suit had also to endure the wholly needless and added anxiety of never knowing on what day or by what man his action would be tried. Nor did the mischief end there. The result of this accumulation of arrears led to the feeling that there was a sense of pressure upon the Bench and to the idea that the Judge felt that the time which was being given to one case was wanted for another succeeding it, and he could conceive no more mischievous impression that could be conveyed to the public mind than that justice was being administered in haste. Whether that haste was due to lack of time or lack of temper it bore a perilous and close resemblance to injustice in its gravest form. If, therefore, the mere appointment of an additional Judge would really remove the causes that had given rise to this condition of things he would not only support the Motion, but the Amendment of the noble Lord the Member for Marylebone and any other Amendment for the appointment of addition Judges without regard to number and salaries. But it seemed to him that first it was essential for the House to consider how the work had been performed by the existing number of Judges. If it were possible to show that by a better arrangement of the work arrears would vanish, that judicial time was wasted that might be saved, then surely the real remedy would be to correct the system under which arrears had arisen and correct them in a form which would strengthen the administration of justice. To appoint an additional Judge to continue the same course would be to perpetuate the trouble which they were there to discuss. He did not know what he had said or done that could lead the learned Attorney-General to suggest that his objection to this Motion had any relation whatever to the personal character of the Judges who administered justice. The hon. and learned Gentleman might at least have remembered that on the only occasion in which he was present in this House when a personal attack was made on a Judge he did his best to resist such an attack and said that he considered that any proceeding of that nature was subversive of the foundation of the administration of English justice. He had said and done nothing which would justify the Attorney-General in saying that his Amendment was founded upon an unchivalrous attack upon the English Judges. His objection was what he had stated in his Amendment, and he thought he could make it plain. He was not going to discuss in detail whether or not the circuit system as it existed at present should be abolished. He knew that upon that topic feelings ran very strongly and certainly that was not the occasion for an elaborate debate upon it. He could, however, point out that the circuit system as it stood led to the most deplorable waste of time and energy and that, without in any way interfering with it as a system, by a slight re-arrangement of business, it might be made to stand in such a position as would render it unnecessary that this Motion should be brought forward at all. Without doubt there were many great centres of commerce in this Kingdom where there should be either district Courts sitting from day to day or a constant transmission of judicial power from the central authority in London. He had only to mention Birmingham, Liverpool, Leeds, Manchester, and Newcastle to enable the House to understand that those centres were the focus of the business activity of a large area, and that it was to the interest of those big centres that there should be a constant sitting of the Courts to adjudicate on the suits that arose. But there were a number of other places which had no such weight and bearing in the State; towns which years ago had been great centres of social life and perhaps of agricultural interests, but time had made great change in the condition of affairs. The whole tide of business had drawn back from their borders and left nothing behind but the silent streets, the empty market place, the ancient and stately Church, the large deserted houses and the fast fading memory of their by-gone pride. Yet once or twice a year the Judge's carriage entered those towns preceded by trumpeters and javelin men and all the solemn paraphernalia of wandering justice. The Judge was given by the sheriff a pair of white gloves, he congratulated the sheriff on the absence of crime in the district, and if he happened to be a Judge seized with a desire for a reform he would humbly suggest that perhaps it ought not to be necessary for a Judge to attend a town where there was nothing to do. That that statement was not exaggerated a few figures would abundantly show. There were fifty-six towns at which civil and criminal cases were tried at the summer assizes. Of those towns there were seven at which no civil case was tried at all in 1905; four in which only one case was tried; ten in which only two cases were tried; thirty-seven where no more than five were tried, whilst there was one town in England in which only one action had been tried in the last five years. But the mischief did not end there. In one town, for three actions and thirteen prisoners 742 jurymen were summoned from their business to discharge their duty to the country. In another town, for four actions and twenty-two prisoners 332 jurors were called away from their vocations, whilst in another with eight prisoners only, 348 jurors or 47 for each wretched prisoner were summoned from their homes and business to discharge their duty in the assize town. That showed that not only in the interests of the economy of judicial time, but in the interests of the economy of the time of business men, this measure should be looked into and receive more consideration than it had. The hon. and learned Attorney-General had referred to the Bar Council. That was a body not remarkable for any socialistic or revolutionary ideas. It was the sober representative body of a sober, and what its enemies might call a dull, profession. During the six years he was a member of the Council its placid conservative calm was never ruffled by any more disturbing element than the always welcome presence of the noble Lord the Member for Marylebone. The Bar Council in 1906 reported that without going into details they had no doubt that the number of assize towns could with advantage be reduced and that a substantial saving of time could thereby be affected. It was not necessary to go to a body that simply represented the profession. He would refer to some statements made in 1899 when an additional Chancery Judge was appointed. The hon. and learned Attorney-General then said that the circuit system was antiquated, troublesome, and costly, but it was popular, and that if they could revise the old method of having three Divisional Courts he believed they would find it unnecessary to increase the present staff. What were the circumstances that had happened since that date which led the hon. and learned Gentleman to change the opinion he then expressed? The figures the hon. and learned Gentleman had given did not show that the arrears were greater now than they were then, and so far as could be seen nothing had changed the aspect of the question between that time and the present. The House must remember that that was directed to the question of whether it was not possible to save the appointment of an additional Judge to the Chancery Division by the loan of a Judge from the King's Bench, and the learned Attorney-General then thought that by a little reasonable re-arrangement it would be unnecessary to make an additional Judge at all. No doubt it was easier to criticise than to construct, but he could not help feeling that the hon. and learned Gentleman might have devoted some time to an attempt to re-arrange the business before he asked the House to sanction the appointment of an additional Judge. That was all he desired. He desired nothing beyond the re-arrangement of the business in the King's Bench, and then the appointment of as many Judges as were necessary to deal quickly and swiftly with the business brought under their consideration. If the hon. and learned Gentleman pointed out that this appointment was nothing but a step and that the reform would follow, then he could only assure the House that if they wished to postpone the reform indefinitely the shortest way was to accept the Motion of the hon. and learned Gentleman. With the additional Judge appointed and the arrears diminished, what reason would there be for troubling the House with a scheme to rearrange the circuit? Although no one attached more implicit reliance to promises coming from the Treasury Bench than he did, he would point out to the House that the promise made by the hon. and learned Gentleman was made in almost the same language as that given upon the question of the appointment of the additional Judge in the Chancery Division. In the course of that debate, Sir Edward Clarke, who looked with suspicion upon the appointment of a new Judge, said that they were told proposals were to be made at an early period with regard to this reform. He was glad that promise had been made and he waited with some confidence for its fulfilment. He (Mr. Buckmaster) knew perfectly well that a statement of such a character might be made under conditions which might well change in the future, and which might prevent their being a complete fulfilment of the promise. He submitted that the House was entitled to know whether any steps had been taken by the late Government or the present to carry out the promise which was supposed to have been made, and on the faith of which Sir Edward Clarke assented to the appointment of the additional Chancery Judge. A Committee was now sitting to consider these matters: why not therefore wait until it had finished its investigation and reported before they appointed a Judge who might be useless? The Committee might report that there was serious need for reform in the administration of affairs. Ten years ago the Bar Committee made a Report which he commended to the attention of the Attorney-General. In that Report they stated that there was no order or method, certainty or continuity, in the constitution and procedure of the Courts. The plan of Regulations for the sittings of the Courts agreed upon at the beginning of the sittings were rarely adhered to. The Judges throughout the sittings were uncertain where they were to sit and what causes or matters they would be called upon to decide; that the result of the system was muddle and confusion of a very serious character and a complete ignorance on the part of the Judges as to the branch of the law with which they would be called upon to deal and the nature of the case which they would be required to try. That was nothing to do with the question of arrears. The Report added that this state of things could not go on without seriously impairing the popular belief in the efficiency of a trial in the Queen's Bench Courts, such delay and such uncertainty having the effect to drive the people of the country, instead of seeking the assistance of the Courts, to arbitration and other methods of settlement. There was no doubt that these appointments could only be made effectual if there was associated with them such a reform as that referred to in the passages to which he had called attention. The Bar Council in 1906 reported that there should be re-adjustment of the business, and concluded in these terms. If such recommendations should be carried out the Judges would be easily able to deal with the business assigned to them. When they were dealing with the matter which vitally affected the welfare of the profession which the Bar Council represented, some effect should be given in that House to the suggestions they made, and the House should pursue the course they indicated, the only course by which this trouble and muddle could be avoided. By no other course could the evil be cured. An instance was given to him recently of the way in which the present system was working against the public interest. On Monday, the first of July, the following solemn announcement was made as to the work in the Courts of the King's Bench Division for the following week. On Monday, two Courts were to sit for special jury cases and two for common jury cases, one Court for non-jury cases and one Court for London special jury cases. It happened on Monday that two Courts did sit for special juries but only one for common juries, and the non-jury Court that was to have one Judge did not have any at all. On Tuesday the same thing happened. On Wednesday the special Judges began to suffer and only one Court sat. That state of things continued until Saturday, when owing to the operation of some mysterious circumstance which could not be discovered out of the six Judges that were to sit for the trial of cases for that week only two were in their Courts. It seemed a small and trifling matter but it most intimately and most vitally affected this very question. Some years ago he was a member of the Committee, and notwithstanding his unfamiliarity with the rules of the King's Bench he was asked to attend and assist in drawing up a set of Rules for the better conduct of those Courts. Certain rules were drawn up, they were received with courtesy and treated with disregard. Nothing was done and nothing would be done unless the House resisted applications such as this for the appointment of a new Judge until the terms of the Amendment which he had not been permitted to move had been carried into effect. Another aspect of the matter which could not be overlooked was that there was a Criminal Appeal Bill before the House and a Bill relating to the revision of the Court of Appeal, and they had this Motion for the appointment of a new Judge. All these matters were intimately associated and should be dealt with together as part of a great scheme for the reorganisation of the King's Bench. He believed that this would involve a question which caused not a little of the difficulties that had arisen. He had no attack to make on any Judge in his personal capacity nor did he desire to criticise any individual who sat upon the Bench, but he did say that it was a great and growing abuse that the floor of that House should be used as a pathway from professional obscurity to professional fame. What lawyer who had ever sat in that House was there who had not been compelled to wince at the taunt that his political interests were co-terminus with his interest for himself. Anybody who knew the history of this country knew that that was false, but notwithstanding that they also knew that there were indisputable facts in their past political or professional history which barbed that sneer with truth. Such a state of things did not only degrade their profession, but also that great Assembly, and if continued must undoubtedly impair and weaken the authority of the English Bench. He knew quite well that to discuss the question of the administration of justice in an assembly where only a portion of its members had any professional interests must necessarily be to discuss a matter which could make a very little personal appeal to them. Many Members of the House thought their association with justice was sufficient when they managed to keep out of contact with it altogether; yet, looked at from the lowest and meanest standpoint, the effective administration of justice was one of our most valuable business assets. It was a vitally essential condition of this great commercial country, not only that its laws should be wisely made, but that they should be wisely administered and administered also promptly, efficiently, and with unvarying impartiality and skill. That there had been difficulties which prevented the realisation of that ideal, everyone who knew the facts admitted. He did not know that that condition called for strong or exaggerated language. He certainly would not say that it was a public scandal, but it was most undoubtedly a great public grievance. He asked the House to believe him when he said that this Motion of the Attorney-General would neither mitigate nor remove that grievance, because the object and purpose of the Motion was to confirm and strengthen a system in whose very constitution lay the seeds of the mischief that they ought to cure.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) said that with a large proportion of the very eloquent and admirable speech to which they had just listened he found himself in complete agreement. Particularly he should desire to associate himself with the veiled and very forcible attack on the system of making political Judges which the hon. and learned Gentleman had made, and he did so with the greatest freedom, because no suggestion of that kind could be brought against the appointments to the High Court Bench which had been made by the present Government. He understood that the Amendment which he had on the Paper (in favour of the appointment of three additional Judges) had been ruled out of order, and he was, therefore, precluded from moving it; but he certainly should not be precluded from supporting the Motion of the Attorney-General, which, though it did not go so far as he desired, seemed to him to be a step in the right direction. In 1869, on the strong representation of the Lord Chief Justice Cockburn, who had been associated with the Liberal Party, three additional Judges were appointed, and eighteen Judges then sat to discharge the duties of the Queen's Bench Division, now the King's Bench Division. Under the Judicature Act of 1873 that number was reduced to fifteen on the understanding that the Chancery Judges should take their share of circuit duty. That scheme broke down altogether in 1883, and had been abandoned; and the result was that they had now fifteen Judges to discharge a very large volume of work. In spite of the eloquence of the hon. Member for Cambridge, surely that clearly showed that there was a very strong *prima facie* case for the creation of a new judgeship. The House should remember that a large number of new duties had been thrown on the King's Bench Judges, not only by the normal increase of business arising from the growth of the population and commercial enterprise, but by the specific allocation to them of certain duties which they did not formerly discharge. There was the Bankruptcy and the Railway Commission work and there was also the recent practice of constituting a Divisional Court of three Judges instead of two. In addition there was the practice which, provided it was restrained within reasonable limits, he thought a desirable one, of appointing Judges to discharge duties outside their direct professional avocation. Judges had been appointed over and over again to sit as presidents or as members of Special Committees to make inquiries in all directions, and this had taken up a very large portion of their judicial time. He could himself recall eleven or twelve of such appointments in quite recent years, and many of them had been very long and laborious inquiries. There was one such inquiry now in progress which had already taken months, and, as far as he knew, might last months more. It was presided over by a member of the Court of Appeal, whose place was filled either by the President of the Divorce Division or by the Lord Chief Justice—more frequently the latter, because the President of the Divorce Division had his own work to dispose of. The result was that the Chief Justice was constantly being required for the Court of Appeal, and this removed one of the Judges from the King's Bench. In addition to that, they had every prospect—he himself was delighted at it—of the Court of Criminal Appeal Bill becoming law in the present year; but he must say that the appointment of one Judge to discharge the duties which would be thrown on the Court of Criminal Appeal was almost illusory. He was quite certain that one Judge would not be sufficient and they would have to face the appointment of more Judges. The Court of Criminal Appeal was desirable for the further security of life and liberty, and the appointment of one, two, or three Judges was really a matter of minor consideration. He must say that there appeared to him to be a very strong case for an addition to the judicial strength. With regard to the Council of the Bar, it was eminently fitted to make inquiries into this subject, both from its own knowledge and from the interest it took in the matter. It had conducted a number of inquiries into the bulk of business in the King's Bench Division and in the Court of Appeal, and with the exception of 1906, in which year he was not familiar with what occurred, he ventured to say that not a single report could be found in which the Bar Council had not recommended an increase of the judicial staff of the country; and it was not quite right for the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge to say that this demand for an additional Judge was made without inquiry and without consideration. It had been inquired into not only by a Special Committee and a Royal Commission, but by a body—the Bar Council—which was almost as capable of conducting such an inquiry as were the Committee or the Royal Commission. He admitted that the Bar Council was a conservative body—almost too conservative for his taste; still, they were not averse to reform in this matter. He agreed that they had urged a better arrangement of business, and particularly a better arrangement of the circuit system, but in spite of all that, they said a further increase of judicial strength was necessary. He was no admirer of the circuit system as it at present existed, and he did not think that any reasonable business man could defend it. It was perfectly true that a great waste of time and money was occurring, and it seemed to him that the circuit system did not afford sufficient opportunities for the discharge of judicial business in populous centres such as Manchester, Liverpool, and other large towns. He was somewhat of a Radical in these matters, and he believed that a Court for such centres would be essential in any rearrangement. They ought to have a regrouping of the circuit system, and a wiping out, if he might so put it, of the smaller towns. He did not think it was quite true that there was no other side to this question. He believed that there was an advantage in the Judges of the High Court going on circuit with all their paraphernalia; he did not believe in the modern utilitarian spirit which would destroy all ceremony; he thought it desirable that there should be emblems of sovereign justice seen throughout the country at various times, so that everybody would know that there were Judges appointed to do justice in the land. He was quite in favour of a complete reconsideration of the circuit system, but did the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge suggest that they were to put off all other reform until that had been done? They had all been talking about the circuit system for twenty years, and they had tried the effect of the starvation policy.

MR. BUCKMASTER: My point is that you should leave off talking about the circuit system and do something.

LORD R. CECIL said that if they appointed the hon. Member dictator something might be done. But what Government would have the courage and public spirit to say, "We are not going this session to have any measure of political importance; we are merely going to try to improve the government of the country?" He should welcome that from the present or any other Government, but he did not believe that they were likely to get such a Government. And how were they going to get through that House a measure, which would certainly raise a storm of local opposition, for the reconstitution of the circuit system? He thought they must put that aside as a practical measure of immediate reform. By all means let them press the Attorney-General of the day to do something and immediately, and some day or other they might happen upon an Attorney-General who would be amenable to such pressure. He agreed with the criticism as to the want of business spirit which characterised the present administration of justice. He thought much might be done to improve the details of the administration of justice. He did not think there was any greater folly than to imagine that all Judges were equally capable of deciding all forms of judicial business. That was the most absurd nonsense, and yet it seemed to be ingrained in the whole atmosphere of the central administration of the Courts of justice. They took a Judge whose experience had been entirely in jury cases, and put him to try questions of law of which he had had no very great experience. Again, they often took a lawyer skilled in the technical details of law and put him to direct a common jury. One of the things that ought to be done should be to appoint special Judges for special classes of work. In that way they would simplify their procedure and do much more good than any reform of this kind could do. Under the present system they tried all cases as if they were precisely of the same character. They tried a libel action in the same way as an ordinary debt-collecting action. In a libel action where two people who hated one another came to demand justice for some grave injury which one had inflicted on the other, it was necessary, in order to secure justice, that they should surround their procedure with every kind of safeguard. They applied the same procedure to a debt-collecting action where the object was to get speedy judgment. He thought all those matters might be dealt with by such an ideal Government as he had suggested, but it would require a great deal of time, and was not likely to be carried out within a reasonable period. He looked back with great regret to the old system which prevailed before the Judicature Act was passed. The throwing of all the Judges into one hotchpotch had been a great mistake. The old system when there were three classes, and some sat in the Court of Exchequer and some in the Court of Common Pleas was much better, because then each Judge took a greater personal interest in the work of his particular division. Personally he would like to go back to something of that kind combined with the specialisation of actions. He agreed with the hon. Member for Cambridge in his desire for reform, but he thought it was rather unreasonable to say that because other reforms were desirable they should decline to accept something which would improve the position of the Court. There was an old French proverb which said, "The better is the enemy of the good," and he would commend that proverb to his hon. friend. He understood that his Amendment was out of order, and so he would content himself with merely supporting the Motion, and he regretted that the Government had not had the courage and had not found the time to go further.

*MR. H. J. CRAIG (Tynemouth) said they all agreed as to the necessity of finding some method of dealing with the arrears of business which had grown up in the King's Bench Division, but what he was unable to accept was that the remedy for this state of things was the appointment of an additional Judge. He believed that the cause of the lamentable state of the business of the Courts lay not in the numerical scarcity of the Judges, but in the continuation of the system under which the Judges of the King's Bench Division were encouraged to go into the country, leaving behind them undone a vast amount of work in London. The Judges went to many towns where there was little or perhaps no work to be done, and delivering gaols at which there were no prisoners waiting to be delivered. This Government, pledged as it was to introduce efficiency and economy into the administration of all public departments ought to do something in the way of removing the many absurd anachronisms of the circuit system which wasted so much of our highly paid judicial time before they recommended the extravagant and useless expedient of appointing an additional Judge. The state of the business in the King's Bench Division had attracted attention for many years, and other remedies besides the one now recommended by the Government had been proposed by other and eminent authorities. He wished to refer for a moment to a Report which he was surprised the Attorney-General had not alluded to, made by the Judges themselves in the year 1892. This was one of those Reports which under the Judicature Act ought to be made every year, but they were told the other day in answer to a Question in the House that in thirty years only three had been made. The Report from which he would quote was the last of the Council of Judges, and in dealing with the question of the waste of time occasioned by the present circuit system they recommended—

> "That the trial of civil disputes in the country should be reorganised. The present civil causes are tried at fifty-six circuit towns twice a year. At forty of the fifty-six the average number is so small that the sending of a Judge or the keeping of a Judge there to try civil causes is a waste of judicial time which is injurious to the due administration of the law."

That was the Report of the Judges of the High Court. The Report further stated—

> "Judges are often employed unnecessarily in the country when their presence is imperatively required in London. The plan provides that the civil causes which are now tried at those forty places should be tried at the eighteen larger places named in the resolutions."

Were they not entitled to ask why the Government had not come down to the House and proposed to put in force some of those useful recommendations which had been made by their own Judges? The Judges were absolutely encouraged to go on circuit because there were extra emoluments for going round the country doing nothing. Not only did the Judges waste their time visiting these places, but surely much of the attendant pomp and circumstance of the assize system had ceased to attract anything but ridicule. Let them take, for instance, the absurdity of a Judge who went to a small country town. The sheriffs met him at the station, trumpets were sounded, and he was escorted to his carriage. He drove off to the Court in order to open the Commission, and then he was conducted to his lodgings. The next day the Judge went in state to charge the Grand Jury, frequently called from their avocations at great inconvenience and personal loss, only to receive a pair of white gloves. He would instance some of the cathedral cities like York. The Judge there not only went through all he had just described, but on the first morning of the sitting he was led off in state to a special service at the Cathedral. After that he went into the town to charge the Grand Jury, and then proceeded to the other end of the town to charge the Grand Jury sitting there. At the end of all this, probably the Judge would find three prisoners waiting to plead guilty. Without elaborating this point further he would just give to the House a quotation from the diary of the late Lord Russell of Killowen when on circuit, which he had abstracted from the admirable life of the late Lord Chief Justice written by Mr. Barry O'Brien—

"On 5th July, 1900, Lord Russell leaves town at 11 a.m. and arrives in Wales in the afternoon. Next day, 6th July, he opens the Commission, receives white gloves, no prisoners to try, and he knew that before he went. The Court rises at 11.15. Next day he has still to be there although there is no work. Next day Sunday. On the Monday he goes off to Dolgelly. On the 11th, he finds his way to Carnarvon, and opens the Court at 10 a.m. There is some work there but it finishes the next day. On the 13th of July the Lord Chief Justice has another free day and visits Penrhyn quarries. July 14th, no work, and he sails in a steam yacht to Beaumaris where he spends the following Sunday. He spends Sunday the 15th at Beaumaris. On the following day he opens the Commission at Beaumaris and receives present of white gloves. On the 17th he drives to Llanfar, and afterwards proceeds to Ruthin. Next day he opens the Commission at Ruthin. The Court sits from 10.30 till 3.15. On the 19th the Ruthin Court sits from 10 till 3. On the 20th no work is done. On the 21st the Mold Court sits and finishes its work by 1 p.m. He spends Sunday 22nd at Chester; On the 23rd drives to Eaton Hall to see the Stud; on the following day he opens the Commission at Chester; and at 1 p.m. on the 25th the criminal work finishes. He returns to London after an absence of twenty-one days and during that time the sittings of the Courts at which he presides last precisely thirty hours."

That was a state of things which ought to be remedied before the Government came to the House and asked that the judicial charges of the country should be increased by the appointment of an extra Judge. Besides the grouping of the civil work which the Judges had recommended, there were one or two other remedies which might be suggested. For instance, in view of the passing of the Criminal Appeal Bill, he would suggest that it might be possible to extend the jurisdiction of some of the Recorders so that they might do more of the criminal work in order that fewer of the trivial cases should occupy the time of the High Court Judges. Surely the time had now arrived when something should be done to provide more continuous sittings for the convenience, not of those members of the bar who were at the top of their profession, but for the convenience of suitors and litigants. In all other professions continuity existed. They could go to church any Sunday in the year, they could consult their doctor or go to their dentist any day, and why should they not be able to go to Court and get their cause heard? He believed that the machinery of the bar was too much carried on in the interest of those at the top of the tree. The bar had been called the oldest trade union in the country, but the distinction between the bar and the other trade unions was that whereas the ordinary trade unions were carried on chiefly, or mainly, for the protection of their weaker members, the bar as a trade union was carried on almost exclusively in the interest of those at the top of their profession. If there were more continuous sittings it was not the briefless barristers who would complain of the opportunity of getting work; they would arrange their holidays so as to get some of the leavings of others. He believed that any and all of the remedies which he had indicated were preferable to that which the learned Attorney-General had recommended to the House, and it was for that reason that he intended to support the opposition to the Motion now before the House.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.) said he approached this question with reluctance, but he did not look upon the proposal now made with surprise. Knowing the facts that were before the Government, and knowing what must be imposed on the judicial Bench if the Criminal Appeal Bill passed into law, about which there could be no doubt, he was convinced that it was absolutely necessary that this additional Judge should, at all events for the present, be appointed. The judicial staff was insufficient in present conditions for the judicial work of the country, and they were bound to see that the judicial work was done. And they were bound to require that judicial power and judicial time should not be wasted. Judicial time and power were great assets of the nation; they did not belong to the Judges. There was a general opinion that trials of the present day were much more protracted than they were formerly. He did not wish to cast reflections on any branch of administration of justice in this country, but he thought that in an excessive desire to hear everybody and to decide every point there was danger of the waste of judicial time and of an enormous addition to the cost of litigation. With regard to judicial power, he thought they could do nothing effectively to improve the administration of justice throughout the country until they had dealt with the circuit system. There should also be an extension of the jurisdiction of the County Courts. A great deal of time was expended by the Superior Courts upon cases which might be dealt with by the County Courts. He thought it was unwise and improper to abstract the Judges from their judicial duties for the purpose of performing political and administrative services. During the last twelve months they had seen this interference with the administration of justice. One of the ablest and most learned and efficient of our Judges—Lord Justice Farwell—had devoted his time and attention to investigating the South African scandals. He did not think it required a Judge for that. The administrative and public services could have been called upon to perform that duty without inflicting upon the administration of justice the loss which it had sustained. Another Judge had given a great deal of time to the inqury into the condition of the Church in Wales. That was not a question of law; it was a question of statistics and of public opinion in Wales. That was not the class of work which the country set up this great judicial body to discharge. He did hope that the public opinion of the country would strengthen the desire of those who wished that judicial time should be devoted to judicial service. The House, he thought, was practically unanimous on this question. At any rate, there was a general feeling in the House in favour of granting the proposed addition to the judicial staff.

*MR. BERTRAM (Hertfordshire, Hitchin) said the right hon. Gentleman who had just spoken in support of the Government proposal began his speech with a quotation that he had intended to use, but which he thought had been incorrectly made. The quotation in question was from a speech of the present Chancellor of the Exchequer in that House in 1899, and the right hon. Gentleman read it to the effect that the Chancellor said he had looked with "surprise," upon a similar proposal made in the year 1899, but what the Chancellor really said, according to *Hansard*, was that he regarded the proposal then made for an additional judge with—

> "suspicion, because it is so much the easiest way of avoiding difficulties and blinding your eyes to the existence of abuses, that one is tempted to take it."

There were one or two points in the speeches of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and of the Attorney-General which he would venture to criticise. The former speaker said that His Majesty's Judges desired this addition, assuming, he supposed that they at any rate were convinced that the block of business in the Courts was due to the lack of system and want of organisation which had existed in their administration of justice for so long. Last Thursday week he put a Question to the Secretary of State for the Home

Department as to how far His Majesty's Judges had complied with the section of the Judicature Act which called upon them not only to meet every year, but to make a report every year to one of the principal Secretaries of State upon the condition of the judicial system, and as to what, if any, alterations ought to be made with a view to the improvement of the machinery of justice; and the answer he received disclosed a condition of things which was the best reply he could give to the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. It appeared that so little were the Council of Judges of opinion that anything need be done that, though they had met every year since 1874, they had only on three occasions thought it necessary to make any report in compliance with the section of the Judicature Act. It appeared to him, therefore, that there was no evidence whatever that the Judges were in favour of this additional appointment. He then came to what was, after all, the most important question. Was there any real reason for assenting to the proposal of the Government? It was said that the block of business was very serious at the present moment. He had taken the trouble to find out what had been the arrears of business in the King's Bench Division for a considerable period of years, and he found that compared with twenty years ago there was now no serious block of business at all. It was perfectly true that on an average the number of actions waiting for hearing at the beginning of the Long Vacation was large, but it was only half the number awaiting decision in 1885. In 1885 the number was over 1,200, and now it had shrunk to something like 600. Then he wanted to ask the attention of the House to the actual amount of work which had been performed by His Majesty's Judges in the King's Bench Division in dealing with civil actions. In 1898 the same number of Judges of that Division, viz., fifteen, gave judgment in no less than 3,050 civil actions, which was at the rate of 203 per Judge. In 1905, the last published year's return, the same number of Judges only succeeded in dealing with 1,967 civil actions, an average of 137 per Judge. That was to say that ten years ago the Judges of the Kings Bench Division dealt with 50 per cent. more actions than in 1905. It would be suggested that there were reasons for that, but in 1898 there was hanging over the King's Bench Division an amount of work which had now been sent elsewhere. Since 1898 there had been no increase whatever in the normal work attached to those Judges; there had been no appreciable increase in the number of criminal cases; there was no increase in the number of cases in the Admiralty, Probate, and Divorce Division, to which cases Judges of the Kings Bench had sometimes to lend their assistance. They had been relieved of a large number of cases by the enlargement of County Court jurisdiction, and there had been an enormous shrinkage in the number of commercial cases. The Commercial cases dealt with about three years ago numbered 270, but they had shrunk in 1905 to 192, and since 1898 the Judges of the King's Bench Division had been relieved by the transfer to the Chancery Division of the whole of that heavy work, which had in former years been done at high pressure and under most unpleasant conditions, the work of winding up Companies in liquidation. In spite of these reductions in the work which they were set to do, the King's Bench Division Judges, in 1905, only dealt with 1,967 cases as against over 3,000 in 1898. Those figures to his mind undoubtedly pointed the remedy. More by good luck than by good management, in 1898 a maximum amount of work was got out of those eminent men who were the Judges of the King's Bench Division, and at the end of that year the arrears which had been 1,200 in 1885, had been reduced to 474, so that it seemed to him perfectly plain that if the House were to insist that re-organisation and system should be introduced into the proceedings of the King's Bench Division, they could very soon wipe off the arrears which were now said to be blocking the Courts. He wished to ask the House to consider how far these arrears were likely to be dealt with by this modest proposal which the Government made. The arrears appeared to number about 660 cases, and if they were really going to deal with the actual number of cases which blocked the Courts at the present moment, they must appoint not one but five additional Judges. It was perfectly futile to come there and suggest that one Judge could deal with the whole of these arrears. The Attorney-General had said a great deal of the complaints of the suitors. He had never himself heard very many of those complaints; they heard a great deal more of them in that House than humble legal practitioners like himself were accustomed to hear from their clients. But the complaints made by suitors were not of the delay which occurred after the case had been entered for trial. What the suitor found expensive and exasperating were those delays which solicitors on both sides found it necessary to interpose between the issue of the writ and the entering of the case for trial, and they might appoint twenty or thirty additional Judges in the King's Bench Division, but no number of them would alter the delays which were thus deliberately interposed; and though they might get a rapid trial once the case was entered, it was of the delays which occurred before the cause was entered for trial that the suitors complained. The question of the reduction of the Long Vacation was a matter upon which he thought members of the bar held but one opinion, but he would remind the House that the whole of the arguments of the Attorney-General could only be met by the abolition of the Long Vacation. It was not by multiplying their Judges that they would ever get rid of the block which must inevitably exist at the beginning of a period of three months entire rest. They would have to provide that the Courts should sit all the year round, if that argument was to be met. But he did not think that proposal was one to which the House ought to assent, because mere additions to the bench would not deal with the real evil. Until they really organised their judicial system, it was idle to suppose that the addition of one Judge would make any material difference to the block of business which was said to exist at the present time, and he was satisfied, and a large number of Members were satisfied, that the reply which had been given by his hon. and learned friend to the Attorney-General constituted an irrefutable answer to the proposals of the Government.

*MR. CLAVELL SALTER (Hants, Basingstoke) said the hon. Member for Hitchin had made the point that they did not need to increase the number of Judges in the King's Bench Division, because the present number would be sufficient if they would make better arrangements and work harder than they did now, but that was a matter of opinion. He had worked in the King's Bench Division for a good many years, and he knew from practical experience what His Majesty's Judges tried to do in the way of arrangements, and how they worked, and how they did not work. They all knew that the capacity of any man, and likewise of any Judge, varied enormously. One Judge could do three or four times the amount of work another Judge could do; but with regard to the point of the hon. Member for Hitchin, he could only express his own opinion, which was founded on long experience, that they would never get rid of the scandal of this block in the King's Bench Division by hoping to appoint more capable or more energetic men than the average of Judges who now administered justice in that Division. He had listened with great admiration and interest to the speech of his hon. and learned friend the Member for Cambridge, and he thought it a very timely and a very useful speech. The whole question of reform in the King's Bench Division work was just now attracting considerable attention, and it was most desirable that it should be fully and freely discussed in that House, but the arguments that his hon. and learned friend put forward did not appear to him in any way to justify the conclusions at which he asked the House to arrive. He said in opposition to the suggestion for another King's Bench Division Judge, that they should first reform the circuit system. He (Mr. Salter) spoke in regard to the circuit system as an old circuit man, and one greatly in sympathy with the circuit ideal. Nothing was easier than to make fun of the weak points in the circuit system, but the ideal which brought justice, and the highest justice, to the door of the suitor was a very fine ideal. They, however, were concerned with the circuit system in that debate only in so far as it affected the judicial strength and time in the King's Bench Division. He said as an old circuit man that for the last ten or twelve years, almost from the time when the present unhappy compromise was first attempted, it had been an admitted failure.

As far back as 1897, in the Report of the General Council of the Bar, they would find that, two or three years after the present compromise in regard to the circuit system was initiated, it was denounced and condemned by the entire legal body, both the barristers and the solicitors, of the country. He fully agreed with his hon. and learned friend that inquiry into the circuit system was necessary—that reform, and sweeping reform, was necessary—but how did that affect this question? What they wanted, to meet an admitted and urgent grievance, was an immediate increase, and a large increase, in the judicial strength of the King's Bench Division, and although he thought that a wise reform of the circuit system would produce some appreciable economy in judicial time, he did not think it would produce anything like enough to meet their present needs, and he was sure it would produce that economy only after a prolonged and difficult inquiry had been gone through. Therefore, he hoped the House would not be led by the argument of his hon. and learned friend to postpone the very meagre instalment of reform which the Attorney-General was offering them till after the conclusion of an inquiry so long and difficult. The other point of his hon. and learned friend appeared to be that they should make better arrangements, and that they should adhere to those arrangements when made. The hon. and learned Member for Cambridge belonged to that Division of the High Court of Justice which, from the lofty pinnacle of an admitted efficiency, looked down upon the futile struggles of its unfortunate sister, the King's Bench Division, with a certain air of superiority; but if his hon. and learned friend lived in the chaos and daily difficulty of the King's Bench Division he would know the reason of those extraordinary changes of plan, and he would know why it was that a Judge of the King's Bench Division was a sort of strange example of the mutability of human affairs, never knowing what a day might bring forth, here to-day and gone to-morrow. The sole reason was that the Court was undermanned. He would like also to refer to the topic of the political appointment of Judges. That was a matter on which it was particularly desirable for all of them to think clearly and to avoid cant. There was no subject on which more cant was talked than that of political appointments to the judicial bench. He thought what his hon. and learned friend said was partly platitude, and partly he did not agree with him. If they were choosing a Judge from a number of eligible candidates, and there was among them one who was really and substantially superior to the others in legal ability or in character, they failed in their duty if they did not select that man. If there was a difference in professional fitness and personal capacity, it was a scandal and a miscarriage if that man was not appointed; but if the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge meant to say that if they had two men of equal professional and intellectual fitness and character they were to postpone the claim of one because he had been or was a Member of that House, he respectfully differed from him. And he would go further than that. Where they conceded that professional claims were equal, not only should they not postpone the appointment of a man because he was a Member of that House, but they were, for two reasons, well justified in preferring him because he was a Member of that House. First, because a man was entitled, other things being equal, to the preference on the ground that he had, at some personal inconvenience and labour, attempted to serve the country in that House according to his lights. They were also entitled to prefer him on the ground that where a man was being called upon to take part in the administration of the law it was of material assistance that he should have some experience in the making of the law. If they once admitted that membership of that House stood in the way of a man, they would exclude men who never could have reached the position to which they had attained, unless they had been a successful combination of the politician and the lawyer. In reference to the Motion of the Attorney-General, his only fear was whether the House was not being asked to dabble and to tinker with a great matter. If they tinkered with it, they not only failed to discharge their duty, which was to get rid of this admitted grievance, but they postponed the day of reform. They ought to take advantage of the public attention which was being attracted to this matter, and to take the opportunity, not merely of remedying this grievance, but, if possible, of remedying the whole evil with which they were concerned. The block of King's Bench business, which was a great grievance and scandal, was not, in his judgment, the fault of the Judges of the division. It was many years since the number of these Judges was increased, and, in the interval, the population had increased, trade had developed, and there was truth in the observation of the Attorney-General that, in consequence of the greater complexity of modern trade operations, modern litigation was much longer and much more cumbrous and elaborate than formerly. But were they not making a great mistake in limiting their inquiry and their remedy to the Attorney-General's Motion? The block was not confined to the King's Bench Division. It was a block in the King's Bench business both of first instance and in the Court of Appeal. He did not, as a member of the legal profession, which he was proud to be, hesitate to say that every day solvent and sensible men in this country submitted to injustice and put aside honest claims rather than submit to the intolerable delay which recourse to the Courts entailed. They thought that litigation ought to be left to fools or very rich men. That was a very great grievance, but the fault rested not with the Judges, but with Parliament. They could have remedied this for years past, and they had failed to do so. The suitor in the Courts complained of three things. He complained of the expense, the uncertainty and the delay. They were without excuse in his presence, because the grievance might be remedied by a small expenditure of money as compared to what would be granted if they were discussing armaments or guns. If they were to grapple with and to remedy this evil, they must not put on a Judge for the King's Bench Division and leave the Court of Appeal alone. The proposal before the House was to tinker with the matter at both ends, and do no permanent good. There were two ways of remedying the evil. The first and better was to strengthen the Court of Appeal so that it would be able to sit permanently in three divisions of three. That would enable the Court to keep abreast of its present work, and to do the appellate work now performed by the King's Bench Division; and the King's Bench, for some years at least, would be able to get on without any addition to the present number of Judges. The other plan was to leave the Court of Appeal as it was, and to strengthen the King's Bench Division, retransferring to it those appellate functions which had been transferred to the Court of Appeal. While he should accept the Attorney-General's Motion if nothing better were forthcoming, he hoped the House would grapple boldly with the grievance. The cost of the judiciary as compared with armanents was trifling. Therefore he urged upon the Attorney-General that they should deal adequately with this matter.

* MR. RADFORD (Islington, E.) said that there was another remedy to which attention had not been called in addition to relegating cases to the county courts and the reform of the circuit system, and that was to shorten the Long Vacation by a fortnight. At present the Long Vacation was fixed to run from the 1st August to the 12th October, nine or ten weeks. Though the strain of judicial work might be great, His Majesty's Judges had, perhaps, recuperative power enough to pull themselves together in a holiday of nine or ten weeks. In addition, moreover, there were the Christmas and Easter and Whitsun vacations, or more than 118 days or nearly seventeen weeks in each year. This reform would bring into effective use more judicial power than would the appointment of a single additional Judge. There were thirty Judges, so that the shortening of the long vacation by a fortnight would mean sixty weeks more of judicial work in the year. A new Judge represented little more than half that. He admitted that the State should be a model employer of labour, but the Judges were not badly treated. They had £5,000 a year, which was a living wage, and a pension after fifteen years service, and their hours of work were from half-past ten till four, with a liberal half-hour for lunch. Those were humane conditions of employment and would continue to be humane conditions, even if the Long Vacation were shortened by two weeks, as it was by Order in Council of 12th December, 1883. He was told that this was an impossible scheme, because it would be resisted by the Judges, but he believed that the Judges

would gladly make this sacrifice of time if it were necessary for the public good.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) wished to contribute to the debate as a lay Member being neither a member of the English Bar nor of the solicitors' profession. It had been suggested that the appointment of a Judge should be deferred pending the Report of the Lord Chancellor's Committee. But in the meantime he offered a suggestion in all good faith to the Attorney-General, so that the administration of justice should not be retarded. In Ireland they had a whole corps of Judges doing nothing. He would propose that Ireland should loan two or three of these Judges. The Irish people would never miss them. He was amazed to hear that on an average there were 550 cases that had gone forward for trial remaining over at the beginning of the Long Vacation. In Ireland it was proved not long ago that the salaries of the Judges in the Common Law Division were larger than the sums recovered during the year in *banc.* It was an easy life for the Judges in Ireland, and a little intellectual exercise on this side of the Channel would do them good. With three exceptions, all the Irish judges were true Protestants, and therefore they could serve very well in England. There used to be a Lord Chief Justice in Ireland—so easy was the life and so great was the want of employment—sitting on the Bench, and at the head of the criminal jurisdiction, at eighty-two years of age; indeed he was so old that his son, sitting in the House of Commons, applied to be relieved of his duties on account of old age. There had been a Lord Chancellor of Ireland, able to discharge the duties of his exalted position, who had arrived at the mature age of eighty-eight; and he had known Judges on the Irish Bench as deaf as every man of eighty-eight ought to be. On the aspect of the case as it affected political appointments to the Bench he recalled the saying of Bacon that the political Judge was a hateful thing. Though it was a hateful thing, they had heard of it in England, but, as far as he was aware, there had been no law officer of the Crown who had ever been accused while on the Bench of having shown political bias. He was glad to hear the noble Lord say the appointments were satisfactory. The law officers of the Crown were necessarily active politicians and naturally got high preferment, but, as far as he was aware, there had been no law officer of the Crown who had ever been accused even inferentially while on the Bench of having shown political bias. But the puisne judges were appointed solely by the Lord Chancellor, and the appointments were within his sole discretion. When the Prince Regent asked Lord Eldon on one occasion to appoint a certain individual to the Bench, Lord Eldon who held on to the Government seat with a tenacity which had only been equalled by a Lord Chancellor of recent times, replied that he would do nothing of the kind; that he would rather resign his appointment than recommend any person, the choice of the Judge being his own prerogative. Lord Campbell in his diary stated that immediately on his appointment as Lord Chancellor a puisne Judgeship became vacant, and that he appointed Colin Blackburn, "whom I scarcely knew, knowing that I shall be torn to pieces to-morrow morning in *The Times* and cold-shouldered by a large number of Liberal Q.C.s." Lord Westbury had gone out of his way to elect non-political persons to the bench. That was the system of legal promotion as formerly understood; but hon. Members had seen in recent years the appointment of gentlemen who were unknown in the Courts, and scarcely known in the House. But they had been speakers in the dull hours of dinner time in the House, who worked, watched, and waited for Governments, and who thought that action in the lobbies of the House was the proper channel through which to get preferment on the Bench. He hoped that the system established within the last twenty years would now come to an end and that appointments to the Bench would be made through professional merit alone. He spoke feelingly on this matter and sympathised fully with the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge in speaking as he did in terms of manly indignation of such appointments, because in Ireland it was not a matter of theory but of practice. No appointment had been made to the Bench in Ireland except for political reasons. He did not say they were not good appointments, but he did say that some of the best men in Ireland, men who had devoted their lives to the practice of the Courts, were never appointed to the Bench. He believed the statement that the Bar was managed in the interest of the leaders to be untrue. The Bar in the best sense of the word was a trade union; they drove out the black sheep, but so long as a man was a member of the Bar he was a friend and a brother. He could not sit down without saying how heartily he agreed with the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge in saying that the Bar on the whole was not a selfish profession. Some of the most illustrious characters and names that had been connected with the House of Commons had belonged to the Bar. But all must admit that the profession was sometimes tarred by selfishness and degraded by their seeing sometimes on the Bench men who ought not to be there.

*SIR J. JARDINE (Roxburghshire) said he intervened for a few moments to state the case as it appeared to him as one of the few men in the House who could regard the matter from the point of view of the Bench itself. He supported the Attorney-General, as the Sovereign was bound by the oath and the Great Charter to see that justice was not delayed. With regard to the remedies and palliatives, it had been suggested that seventeen weeks holiday in the course of the year was rather a large amount of leisure time, even for learned Judges engaged in dealing with the most complicated cases. In the High Court of Bombay the period of the Vacation, in a worse climate and in a Court which had to administer every one of the systems of law known to that Court and to administer them mostly in foreign languages, they got on with far fewer weeks. In Bombay the Courts sat from eleven to five, with a short interval for lunch, which was in his case well filled up by listening to reports from registrars, passing orders of superintendence, of inferior tribunals, or looking up cases. Comparing London with Bombay, the hours here could hardly be called long. With regard to the employment of Judges on Commission, while no doubt it was a case for grave consideration—the public service did sometimes require that a learned Judge should be a Member—it was an undesirable necessity even then, not only on the ground that it was taking up judicial time, but that the proper place where a Judge should be found was the Court of Justice. After considering the reasons and the circumstances he thought this House might vote this Resolution provided these reforms were taken in hand. It appeared to him strange and extraordinary that the highest Judges in the realm should go to these little towns where there was no business to do. The custom of the Judges going on circuit was noted by Sir Henry Sumner Maine as an illustration of the fact that nothing in England wholly died. Every year there was this procession of justice with its trumpeters and javelin men. It was a survival of the royal tours of the old Norman and Anjevin Kings before the Court of Common Pleas was fixed at Westminster Hall in the time of King John, and useful in checking and controlling the barons in their own domains and for doing justice which corrupt Sheriffs had refused. It was ancient and picturesque, but the modern utilitarian arguments seemed to prove that those towns where the business was hardly worth troubling about should be made to send their cases to greater centres where it was necessary to send a Judge, and to see that justice was done and done without delay.

MR. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire) said he regretted that with this proposal for the appointment of an additional Judge there should not be put forward at the same time proposals for the systematic reform of our judicial system in order to save judicial time. He submitted that if one additional Judge was appointed he would not be able to cope with the additional work that would be thrown upon the Courts in connection with the Criminal Appeal Bill. One additional Judge would not be able to cope with the extra work that was now before the Courts. Again, the Patents Bill if it became law would throw additional work on the Judge. It would throw upon him work now done by the law officers of the Crown and the Controller of Patents, and he anticipated that for practical purposes patent cases in the near future would probably be found to need a Judge for themselves. In the absence of definite proposals for a a systematic reform of the judicial system, he feared that the appointment of the additional Judge would be merely a palliative and not a remedy, and one which would postpone the issue instead of hastening it.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) called attention to the practice of wholesale summoning of jurors in cases where their services were not required. There was also, he said, a great lack of even distribution of these summonses, especially in the suburbs of London. He knew of cases where individuals had been summoned more than once a year, whereas their neighbours continually escaped, and it was those who had little to do who seemed generally to be let off. The summonses, too, seemed to rain on particular suburbs, and even on particular streets, while the recipients were generally clerks and persons who could not well spare a day, while the well-to-do generally escaped summons. He thought as judicial reform was in the air, it should be accompanied by reform in this respect also.

SIR JOHN WALTON said the Committee to which reference had been made was considering every one of the suggestions which had been made in the course of the debate. He hoped that that Committee would be able to furnish a Report before the end of the present year, and that it might be possible to bring in a Bill founded upon their recommendations before the end of next session. By the rearrangement of business recommended by that Committee it might be unnecessary to appoint a Judge to succeed the present appointment. He assured the House that all the reforms which had been referred to would receive full consideration, and that the Government were determined that legislation would be carried into law at the earliest possible moment.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 155; Noes, 41. (Division List No. 279.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Alden, Percy
Ashley, W. W.
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.SirH.
Baker,Joseph A. (Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Beach, Hn. Michael HughHicks
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Boulton, A. C. F.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brunner,J.F.L. (Lancs.,Leigh)
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt.Hon.Victor C.W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clough, William
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crombie, John William
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar,Sir J.A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson,W.H. (St.Pancras,N.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Erskine, David C.
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gulland, John W.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Higham, John Sharp
Hills, J. W.
Hobart, Sir Robert
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jardine, Sir J.
Jones,SirD.Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,SirJoseph F.(Accrington)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncaster
Noaln, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Pearson,W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Price,C.E. (Edinburgh,Central)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Rees, J. D.
Rickett, J. Compton
Robertson,Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradford
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L

Scott, A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Turnour, Viscount
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarthen
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Williamson, A.
Wilson, Hon. C.H.W.(Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Ashton, Thomas Gair
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring,Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Beale, W. P.
Bertram, Julius
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Cleland, J. W.
Clynes, J. R.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Crean,,Eugene
Crooks, William
Fell, Arthur
Gretton, John
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hodge, John
Hudson, Walter
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kelley, George D.
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs.
Macpherson, J. T.
Nicholls, George
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pollard, Dr.
Radford, G. H.
Richards,T.F.(Wolverhampton
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Shackleton, David James
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Stanley,H.A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Summerbell, T.
Thorne, William
Watt, Henry A.
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Buckmaster and Mr. Herbert Craig.

Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty representing that the state of business in the High Court of Justice is such as to require the appointment of an additional Judge, and praying that His Majesty will be graciously pleased to appoint a new Judge of the said High Court in the King's Bench Division thereof, in pursuance of the eighteenth section of The Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876.

To be presented by Members of the Privy Council and of His Majesty's Household.

TELEGRAPH (MONEY) BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee) considered.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) moved to leave out the words, "Without prejudice to the exercise of any powers previously given for the like purpose." It was pointed out on the last occasion that although this money was voted for telephone extension the Bill was called the Telegraph Bill, and the statement of the Postmaster-General was the only guarantee which the House had that the money would not be allocated to other purposes than the telephonic system. That being so, the right hon. Gentleman had put down an Amendment for the purpose of safeguarding the object he had in view. What he desired to know was whether if these words were left in they would not prevent the purpose which the right hon. Gentleman had in view in proposing his Amendment. If they were not superfluous he would not oppose them, but as he thought they were, he begged to move.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood) formally seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 7, to leave out from the word 'system,' to the word 'issue' in line 8.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said it was a mistake to suppose that these words had any effect in regard to the £6,000,000. They only applied to small amounts—a balance already existing. "Like purpose" clearly meant telephonic purpose.

Sir F. BANBURY asked under these circumstances what was the amount of the balance and why this was necessary. This Bill did not abrogate any existing Act, and he did not know there was any necessity to confirm an Act already in existence.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON said he had been advised by his advisers that these words were necessary in order to secure the balance in the new Act, and the words only proposed to cover that balance.

Mr. BOWLES said the right hon. Gentleman had told the Committee that he had an unascertained balance which was applicable to this purpose. His object in seconding the Amendment was to obtain information as to the position in which this telephone business now stood. The right hon. Gentleman had resisted both in the House and upstairs the demands of the hon. Member for Preston for a clear statement of the large and growing demands of these services. A vital element in the matter was what amount the right hon. Gentleman had now which was applicable to this service. The Postmaster-General wanted £6,000,000 to spend in the next four years, but he had not said, and apparently did not know, how much money he already had. He was informed that the amount was something like half a million.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON said the unexpended balance on 31st March last was £250,000, and there were a few thousands still in hand.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.) said there was some little confusion about the balance in hand. The right hon. Gentleman first spoke of a few thousands, his hon. friend then said he had heard it was £500,000, and now the right hon. Gentleman said it was £250,000 in March last, but that it had now been almost wholly expended on the telephone service.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. BOWLES moved an Amendment to limit the rate of the expenditure of £6,000,000 to £1,500,000 a year. He said it would be in the remembrance of those who were present on the last occasion that the Postmaster-General told them that he proposed to spread this item of £6,000,000 over four years; that it was not his intention to exceed an expenditure of £1,500,000 a year. It was exceedingly important from the point of view of national credit that not more than £1,500,000 should be spent in any one year on this particular service. They did not know exactly what was the position of this large and growing concern; all they knew was that it might involve a considerable growing loss to the people of the country. Therefore, in view of the right hon. Gentleman's pledge, as he took it to be, that he would not spend more than £1,500,000 in any one year, he begged to move.

Sir F. BANBURY, in seconding the Amendment, expressed the hope that the right hon. Gentleman would accept it. All it asked him to do was to carry out what he himself had said he intended to do. It had been pointed out to the Postmaster-General that the state of the money market was such that even the anticipation of an issue of £6,000,000, though not issued all at once, would have nearly as bad an effect on the market as the issue of £6,000,000 immediately. Although they did not doubt the sincerity of the right hon. Gentleman's promise that the expenditure should be spread over four years, if during that time the Party now in Opposition were returned to office and embarked on what hon. Members opposite called a policy of extravagance, there was nothing in the Bill to ensure that the intention of the right hon. Gentleman would be carried out.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 9, after the word 'sums,' to insert the words, 'not exceeding one and a-half million pounds in any one financial year, and.'"—(*Mr. Bowles.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON said that it would be impracticable to accept the proposal, as it would be impossible to anticipate what amount would actually be spent in each year. His statement to the House on the Second Reading was that the £6,000,000 would be spread over four years, but he had not said, and could not say, that in no one year would more than £1,500,000 be spent. Some of the money would be spent on new exchanges in London, and he might be asked to purchase one or more of the remaining municipal systems; and so an unexpected charge might be thrown on a particular year, with the result that there would be a larger expenditure that year and a smaller expenditure in the next. It was impossible to estimate from year to year what amount would be expended, but, as he had said, the £6,000,000 would be fairly spread over the four years, although it would be impossible to limit the expenditure in the way proposed to £1,500,000 each year. It had been remarked that fixing the period of four years was to avoid the criticism of the House of Commons, but if that were so there would be the greatest possible temptation to his successor to spread the money over the longest period possible. He did not think that the limitation proposed by the Amendment was in any way required. There was no desire to spend this money except in a *bona fide* way and in the direction desired by the House of Commons.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham) thought the *gravamen* of the charge as to this being a rash speculation rested upon the late Government and not upon the right hon. Gentleman. He thought, however, that they should have rather more assurances from the right hon. Gentleman that the whole of this £6,000,000 would not be spent at once. There was no doubt, as he thought the Postmaster-General would himself admit, that this was a very rash speculation, and it was doubtful whether it could be made a financial success. He thought that, therefore, the Post Office ought to go slowly in the matter; it was reasonable to ask the Postmaster-General not to spend more than a certain amount each year, and he should bind himself to that effect. The House should guard against the whole of this money being spent in the first two years. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would give them the assurance that the money would be spent in the most careful way and with the minimum of risk to the taxpayers. In the absence of any such assurance, he for one intended to support the Amendment.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) said that if the hon. Member opposite reflected he would see that the course which he proposed might have most serious inconveniences. Supposing that this Bill had been not for four but for forty years, surely it would be inconvenient that the House of Commons should vote such a large sum of money in 1907 to last to the year 1947, simply on the assurance that so much would be spent in each year. The really important thing was to keep the control of the House of Commons over the expenditure, but they did not retain that control simply by insisting that the total sum spent should not exceed a certain amount in any one year. It might be necessary to spend more in one year and less in another as might prove convenient. Therefore, the really important point was to get a reduction of the total sum asked for in order to compel the Postmaster-General to give the House an account and justify the demand.

*MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) thought that the right hon. Gentleman was largely and personally responsible for the impression that this expenditure was to be spread over four years and that in any one of the four years the expenditure was not to exceed £1,500,000. That was the recollection of his hon. friends around him of the statement made by the right hon. Gentleman in Committee. As that did not appear on the face of the measure itself, his hon. friend by his Amendment was endeavouring to place it there, or at any rate to secure from the right hon. Gentleman an assurance more definite and personal than they had heard, that that was the method in which he proposed to deal with this vast sum. He would also like an assurance from the right hon. Gentleman that in contemplation of taking over the National telephones he would so use the money in developing the system that there should be no waste in the sense of overlapping or duplication.

*MR. SPEAKER: That does not arise on this Amendment.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.) said he concurred in the view that the House ought to retain its control over the expenditure of such a large sum of money. He thought that the anxiety of the electors was very largely aroused about these great commercial enterprises undertaken by municipalities and experimentally by the London County Council——

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is getting a long way from the subject of the Amendment.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT said he was intending to illustrate the danger of these great industrial enterprises being in the hands of municipalities or departments of the Imperial Government like that of the Postmaster-General.

*Mr. SPEAKER: That is a good objection to the Bill itself, but not to this Amendment.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT said he entirely agreed that there ought to be a constant and vigilant control over expenditure by the House of Commons, and that could only be effected by keeping a careful watch over the annual expenditure.

Mr. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) said the point raised by the Amendment was not so much one of controlling a large expenditure as of borrowing a sum of £6,000,000 in one year. The words used by the Postmaster-General on the last occasion he took as being a complete reassurance on the point, and by the Amendment they were merely carrying out what the right hon. Gentleman had said. What the right hon. Gentleman had said when they talked of disarranging the money market by issuing a loan of £6,000,000 forthwith, was that the amount would be issued in small sums from time to time, and in one year probably the sum would exceed £1,500,000, and they would not go to the public market at all. Possibly that had escaped the mind of the right hon. Gentleman, and it was in that spirit that this Amendment was moved.

*Mr. STEADMAN (Finsbury, Central) said that as a member of the Committee which had this Bill before them, he would like to say a word or two in reply to what had been said. The right hon. Gentleman had been asked for an assurance whether this or that was going to be done, but in his opinion, whatever assurance the Postmaster-General gave, hon. Members on the other side of the House would not be satisfied. If there was extravagance in spending the ratepayers' money or the money of the taxpayers, the responsibility rested on those who were elected by the people to look after their interests.

Sir F. BANBURY: We are doing that now.

*Mr. STEADMAN: Yes; he knew they were, but what was the reason they were doing it? He remembered that the Postmaster-General under a Conservative *régime* gave a fourteen years lease to the Telephone Company. He was prepared to say that if that lease had not been granted the present Postmaster-General would not have needed to come to the House at this juncture to ask for £6,000,000. The real objection of Members who supported the Amendment was that they were there to champion the interests of monopoly, which it was the intention of the Bill to break down. It was useless to bind the Postmaster-General to a certain expenditure each year, for it was obvious that whatever sum they might fix it would in some year or other be exceeded, perhaps by only a few pounds, and the result of tying the right hon. Gentleman's hands might be that work would be delayed. It was that form of meddling and muddling that very often prevented municipal or State employment from paying the same profit as private enterprises. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would adhere to his Bill.

Mr. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) said the last speaker had dwelt very much on the fact that they wished to tie down the Postmaster-General to £1,500,000 each year. They did not wish to do that; they simply wished to have in the Bill what the Postmaster-General said was his intention when the matter was last discussed. The hon. and learned Member for Cambridge University had read the clear statement of the right hon. Gentleman that £1,500,000 would be required for each of the four years, and his hon. friend had put an Amendment on the paper to carry out that object. He could not understand what objection the Postmaster-General could have to the Amendment, and he would be very glad to hear what explanation he had to give.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON said he had already given his reasons why he could not accept the Amendment. He had used the words "probably a million and a half," for it was perfectly obvious that some years there would be a little more expenditure and another year a little less.

Question put—

The House divided :—Ayes, 22; Noes, 189. (Division List No. 280.)

AYES.

Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Corbett, T. L. (Down, N.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Gretton, John
Hills, J. W.
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt-Col A. R.
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Turnour, Viscount
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Bowles and Sir Frederick Banbury.

NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Boulton, A. C. F.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hn. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S Pancras, W
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H (St. Pancras N.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards Clement (Denbigh)
Erskine, David C.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden. John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kilbride, Denis
Laidlaw, Robert
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Crae, George
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel

Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien,Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson,W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Pollard, Dr.
Priestley,W.E.B. (Bradford,E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson,Rt. Hn. E.(Dundee)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway. E.)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley,Hn. A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W.C.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thorne, William
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, J. D.(Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams,Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wilson, Hn.C.H.W.(Hull,W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T.(Westhoughton)
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

*MR. HAROLD COX moved an Amendment to cut down the proposed expenditure from £6,000,000 to £3,000,000. In the first place, this sum was larger than had ever before been asked for by the Post Office; it was twice as large as any sum asked for previously by the Department. It was quite true that the sum asked for was to be spread over four years, but surely they had to take into consideration the amount as well as the time, and he proposed, instead of £6,000,000 in four years, £3,000,000 in four years. A further reason for reducing this sum was that the Postmaster-General had assured them that he would devote a portion of the recess to working out a better financial statement of the telephone accounts. But he thought that they ought to have the advantage of the Postmaster-General's work before they were committed to so large an expenditure. The right hon. Gentleman claimed that though they were losing nearly £1,000,000 a year on telegraphs, they were actually making a small profit on telephones. He repeated that he did not know how they were to make that certain, the accounts being so badly kept, and he used the word "badly" advisedly. In the Postmaster-General's report different figures were given on different pages for the same item. When they found such a thing as that in the annual report they were justified in saying that before the House sanctioned this enormous expenditure they ought to have a clear statement. The Postmaster-General had very fairly met him on that question, but they would not have this statemnt made until the autumn. Let him prepare his statement in the autumn and then two years hence come and ask for an extra £3,000,000. The House had spent five hours in discussing this sum, and it was not too much that the House of Commons, which was the custodian of the nation's business, should devote five hours once again to the consideration of such a huge amount as £6,000,000 sterling. The Postmaster-General had himself said more than once—and he was quite sure that he had not done so merely out of courtesy—that he welcomed the debate, as it would strengthen his hands and enable him to resist pressure for concessions which would involve loss. They wanted to strengthen his hands again two years hence, because he was quite sure that in the interval of two years there would be a great deal of other pressure put upon the right hon. Gentleman by well-to-do people to have telephones supplied to them at less than cost price and at the taxpayers' expense. £6,000,000 represented the entire proceeds of the sugar tax, and he questioned whether it was right to maintain a tax involving a burden upon the poorest class of taxpayers for the purpose of subsidising a service largely used by the well-to-do classes. That was the reason why he thought the House of Commons should have an opportunity of examining the accounts which the Postmaster-General had promised to prepare in order to see whether this business was being run on right lines.

MR. GRETTON (Rutland) seconded the Amendment. To him this measure afforded a glaring instance of the lax way in which the House of Commons dealt with the expenditure of very large sums of money. No board of directors or committee of shareholders would venture to embark upon an expenditure of any sum very much less than this unless those who were proposing the expenditure were prepared to submit a statement of accounts, or a reliable estimate as to the way it was proposed to expend the money. The Post Office had taken no trouble to look into the matter; the Postmaster-General was asking authority to raise £6,000,000, and he had not been able up to now to present any accounts whatsoever to the House. He did not think the public departments of the Government ought to be allowed to transact their business in this way, and he entered a strong protest against the manner in which the House was being treated in regard to these loans. He wished to endorse the remarks made by the hon. Member for Preston as to the great risks which would be run by the taxpayer. Proper accounts ought to be prepared before the House was asked to expend a further £6,000,000 on the telephone service. It was not desirable to raise a large sum of money in the present state of the money market, and the raising of another £6,000,000 would have very serious effects.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 10, to leave out the word 'six' and insert the word 'three.'"—(*Mr. Harold Cox.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'six' stand part of the Bill."

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) urged the Postmaster-General to agree to the Amendment to accept £3,000,000 now and come again for the rest. It was a fact that in this country the telephone was a luxury, and the reason why it was so dear and had to be subsidised out of the taxes was that it was under Government management. Elsewhere, in the remotest parts of Europe, and even on the borders of Lapland, an excellent service was found, cheap and efficient, but in this country it was only possible to have the telephone at a comparatively high price and of very moderate efficiency. It was the system of Government management that ruined the whole thing. An hon. Member had asked why, if the Government of India could manage telephones and telegraphs at a profit, we could not do the same in this country. India was not that example of socialistic enterprise which, no doubt very much to the surprise of that benevolent bureaucracy, it was frequently described as being in the House of Commons. He could quote instances of successful Government enterprises taken up there solely because private enterprise was wanting, being dropped as soon as private individuals were ready to take them over because it was considered unjust and improper that the taxpayers should compete with what was the proper province of private enterprise. The railways again were chiefly made with Government capital, or were guaranteed, and even then management by a company was generally preferred. The accounts in all enterprises managed by Government Departments were not kept in a manner that would give satisfaction to the shareholders of a company; and the accounts of the Post Office would not be satisfactory until the telegraphs and telephones accounts were kept separately, which he understood the Postmaster-General contemplated. He did not oppose the Bill, but he supported the Amendment of his hon. friend the Member for Preston.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR supported the Amendment. Personally, he would have no objection to the Post Office taking over the telephones, but he objected to spending upon them such a large sum of money, because the whole thing had been entered into without a proper idea of the financial and other responsibilities involved. The right hon. Gentleman was not so much to blame in this matter as the right hon. Member for East Worcestershire, who was Postmaster-General when the scheme was first entered upon. He did not think that even now it was too late for the House to avoid the effect of that mistake, but the Government ought not to enter into the undertaking without adequate safeguards. The Post Office was a more or less risky business, but that risk would be very much increased if this huge network of telephones was placed in their hands. He had been amazed in this discussion at the lack of information at the disposal of the right hon. Gentleman as to the method in which this money was to be spent. The truth was that the permanent officials of the Post Office had got an idea that by means of the telephone they were going to make up for previous misfortunes in connection with the telegraphs. He had no objection to the Government taking over the telephone system which was a legitimate business for them to control, but they ought to have some undertaking from the Post Office that that service would be cheaper and more efficient in the future, and that the mistakes which had been made in regard to the telegraphs would not be repeated. He could not understand why the right hon. Gentleman did not furnish them with some specific and proper account of how it was proposed to spend this money. A number of instances, which could easily be multiplied, had been given of cases in which it was difficult to make out Post Office Estimates. A perusal of the Estimates would convince anyone that they were laid before the House in such a way that nobody could tell how the money was going to be spent. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would undertake to supply hon. Members with information showing exactly how this money would be spent, how far the undertaking had been a success up to now, and what guarantee they had that the mistakes of the past would not be repeated. Even countries like the

United States hesitated in the matter of the telephone service, and the effect of the American Government not taking over that service had been to give the United States a far more efficient and a cheaper service. It was too late for the Postmaster-General to undo the unfortunate bargain which had been made by his predecessor, but it was not too late to safeguard the position of the House and the taxpayers with regard to this Vote.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON hoped the Amendment would be rejected, because he was really following precedent in this matter. When money was previously taken for a limited period the circumstances were different, as the policy of the country in regard to telephones was unsettled. The reason for now financing for four years was that in 1911 the National Telephone Company would become a public institution. Ample opportunity would be given for the reconsideration of the telephone system on the Bill which would then have to be introduced. He would not be surprised if it became necessary, for various reasons into which he need not enter, to introduce that Bill three years hence. There would also before that be ample opportunity on the Estimates for the House to consider rates and other questions; and he would welcome on the Estimates support given to him against importunities for greater expenditure. The hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London had expressed some alarm lest the whole of this £6,000,000 would be put on the market. He agreed with the hon. Baronet that nothing could be worse than to attempt to float a £6,000,000 loan at the present time, but the money would not be put on the market. It would be issued from time to time as it was required, and would be taken from Government Departments, such as the Post Office Savings Bank. In regard to the general criticisms that had been made, he could only repeat what he had said on the Second Reading, that, as far as the telephone system was concerned, it was the desire of the Post Office to carry it on on business principles. It ought to pay interest on capital, provide a proper sinking fund, and produce a small profit in addition. The rates would be kept as low as possible, but, as a public department ought to meet the convenience of the public, they would revise the rates with that object in view. The capital expenditure he asked for was not excessive, and would carry them over a short period, after which the whole matter would have to be reconsidered and the House of Commons would have a full opportunity of considering it as a whole.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) said that everyone would rejoice at the statement just made by the Postmaster-General that it was intended to keep the accounts more closely on business lines. With that object in view the right hon. Gentleman was about to revise the rates. When powers were being taken to borrow this large sum of money, the Postmaster-General might be asked to give some assurance on the subject of rates. He had been getting resolutions lately from chambers of commerce and other business associations in Lanc shire to the effect that the alteration in rates contemplated would be likely to put difficulties in the way of the extension of the use of the telephone. That surely was not the desire of the right hon. Gentleman. If the telephone system was to be conducted on business lines, it was clearly the interest of the post office that every facility should be afforded to those who wished to use it. In Lancashire, and in the commercial community generally, there was considerable anxiety on this point, and he hoped that at a later period of the session the right hon. Gentleman would make some precise statement as to what the new arrangements were going to be.

*Mr. HELME (Lancashire, Lancaster) asked whether the Government had already made up their minds on the question of granting facilities for the continuance and development of local municipal telephone systems. In the evidence given before the Select Committee who considered the proposal that the Government should take over by purchase the business of the National Telephone Company, it was stated that the municipalities gave a lower rate than the company, the annual subscription for an unlimited service by the Corporation of Glasgow being about five guineas. It was, he thought, the desire of all that under whatever arrangements might be made, whether the telephones were controlled by the Government or by municipalities, every householder or tradesman should be able to become possessed of a telephone at the reasonably low subcription named.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON said that that was a subject on which the Government had still an open mind.

*Mr. BYLES (Salford, N.) said that when the Bill was in Committee he was one of the small minority who supported the Amendment now before the House, and consistency required that he should do so now. But he confessed that he did not like his company. He specially desired to dissociate himself from the arguments used by the hon. Member for the Montgomery Boroughs in support of the Amendment.

*Mr. REES: The feeling is quite reciprocal.

*Mr. BYLES said his sole reason for supporting the Amendment was that it seemed to him £6,000,000 was too large a sum to allow the Postmaster-General to obtain from the Treasury during the next four years in connection with the telephone enterprise. He did not in any way desire to check the carrying out of an efficient telephone system, but he thought that when half of the amount now asked had been spent the right hon. Gentleman should come back and ask for the rest in order that the House might have another opportunity for a debate of this kind.

Sir F. BANBURY said it did not matter to him with whom he voted so long as his vote was a proper one. If the Amendment to reduce the amount by one-half were carried, he failed to see where the Postmaster-General would lose. All that would happen would be that when the £3,000,000 had been expended he would have to come back to the House of Commons and ask for another grant. The Amendment only carried out the principle advocated by right hon. Gentlemen opposite—namely, that the House of Commons should have full control of the national expenditure. He denied that there was, as the hon. Member for Central Finsbury had said, a desire in this matter to maintain monopoly and privilege. What he and his friends desired was to maintain the control of the House of Commons over the expenditure of the nation, and to see that the expenditure was carried out with due economy. The right hon. Gentleman had said very truly that something was going to take place in 1911. In that year they were going to buy up the business of the telephone company. The capital of the company was £10,000,000, and in view of the assurance lately given that there was to be no confiscation in another matter, he presumed that there would be no confiscation in this case. He thought he had some reason to say that the amount paid to the company would not be less than £10,000,000. So that even if the Amendment was carried, there would be an expenditure of something like £13,000,000 in the next four years in connection with the telephones. It had been stated that the telephones were to be worked on business lines; the Government must, therefore, be careful not to spend money in the next four years which might be wasted by duplication. The telephone service was used by the richer classes, and the whole nation paid for it. The House ought to take care that the richer classes paid a sufficient sum to recompense the State for expenditure, interest, and sinking fund. He supported the Amendment.

MR. RAWLINSON reminded the House that they were custodians of the public purse. When large sums were entrusted to the Government ordinary business precautions ought to be taken. The Postmaster-General thought the telephone system had been carried on at a profit, but had given no figures nor details. Yet they were asked to embark on a further expenditure of £6,000,000, which would not be required this year nor next year. It had not been pleaded that there was urgency for the expenditure. The Postmaster-General had been perfectly frank in stating that he did not intend to spend it all at once. He hoped the House would not vote the whole of the £6,000,000 on such information as they had now before them.

Question put.

The House divided: — Ayes, 172; Noes, 24. (Division List No. 281)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Ambrose, Robert
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Beale, W. P.
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Branch, James
Bright, J. A.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Cameron, Robert
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Erskine, David C.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucas
Halpin, J.

Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Laidlaw, Robert
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.
Pullar, Sir Robert
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thorne, William
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Williamson, A.
Wilson, Hon. C. H. W. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Byles, William Pollard
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craik, Sir Henry
Hills, J. W.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt-Col. A. R.
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Rees, J. D.
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Harold Cox and Mr. Gretton.

And, it being Five of the clock, further proceeding on consideration of the Bill, as amended, stood adjourned.

Bill, as amended (by the Standing Committee), to be further considered upon Monday next.

———

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP J).

Major SEELY reported from the Committee on Group J of Private Bills: that Mr. Strauss, one of the Members of the said Committee, was not present during the sitting of the Committee this day.

Report to lie upon the Table.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to Standing Order No. 3.

Adjourned at five minutes after
Five o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 15*th July*, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bills:—Board of Education Scheme (Hulme Trust Estates Educational) Confirmation; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7).

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Bude Gas Bill; King's Norton and Northfield Urban District Council Bill.—Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments; and passed, and returned to the Commons.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1^{a}, and referred to the Examiners.

Dundee Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 1.) Bill [H.L.]; Pontypridd Urban District Council Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Kendal Corporation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Wisbech Water Bill [H.L.]; United Methodist Church Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments: the said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Great Northern and City Railway Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendment agreed to.

Rawtenstall Corporation Bill; Great Central Railway Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill.—Read 3^{a} (according to order), with the Amendments; and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.].—Read 3^{a} (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.

Report from the Committee of Selection, that the following Lords be proposed to the House as the panel of Lords to act as Commissioners under the Act, viz:—

L. Stewart of Garlies (*E. Galloway*),
L. Sanderson;

agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly.

TREATY SERIES, No. 18. (1907).

General Index to Treaty Series, 1902–1906.

IMPERIAL COLLEGE.

Imperial College of Science and Technology, Charter of Incorporation (8th July, 1907).

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3857. United States (Texas).

ARMY.

Principles to be kept in view in training the Territorial Force and the Special Contingent.

Report of the Conference appointed to examine the shops and machinery at Woolwich Arsenal (except Danger Buildings and Torpedo Factory), in order to consider whether any article not now made in the Ordnance Factories can appropriately be made there with this machinery; with minutes of proceedings and appendices.

GOVERNMENT FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS COMMITTEE.

Report of the Government Factories and Workshops Committee.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

ARMY.

(Army Reserve).—Further regulations relating to the Army Reserve.

(Militia).—Further regulations relating to the militia.

SUPERANNUATION.

Treasury minute, dated 2nd July, 1907, granting a retired allowance to Hugo Meyer, late counter clerk and telegraphist, Post Office, under Section 2 of the Superannuation Act, 1887.

POST OFFICE.

(Foreign and Colonial Post).—The Foreign and Colonial Post Amendment (No. 17) Warrant, 1907, dated 24th June, 1907.

(Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post).—The Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 7) Warrant, 1907, dated 24th June, 1907.

COMPANIES (WINDING-UP).

Sixteenth General Annual Report by the Board of Trade under Section 29 of the Companies (Winding-up) Act, 1890.

PACIFIC CABLE ACT, 1901 (ACCOUNT 1906-1907).

Account showing the money issued from the Consolidated Fund under the provisions of the Pacific Cable Act, 1901, and the money received, expended, and borrowed, and securities created under the said Act, to the 31st March, 1907; together with report of the Chairman of the Pacific Cable Board.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

ARMY (PAY, NON-EFFECTIVE PAY, AND ALLOWANCES.)

Lists of exceptions to the Army Regulations as to pay, non-effective pay, and allowances sanctioned during the year 1906–1907. Presented (pursuant to Royal Warrant dated 27th October, 1884), and ordered to lie on the Table.

BATTLESHIPS AND ARMOURED CRUISERS.

Return showing the comparative strength in completed first class battleships less than twenty-five years old, and armoured cruisers less than twenty years old of Great Britain, the United States of America, France, Germany, and Japan, on 1st June, 1907. Presented, (pursuant to order of the 4th instant), and to be printed. (No 111.)

LIGHTS ON VEHICLES BILL.

Brought from the Commons, and read 1ª, and to be printed. (No 112.)

PYROTECHNIC MORSE CODE.

LORD **MUSKERRY**: My Lords, I beg to ask His Majesty's Government the Question standing in my name on the Paper, namely, whether the Board of Trade have as yet been notified by the Admiralty that they do not propose to introduce into the Royal Navy the Pyrotechnic Morse Code which was recommended by the Admiralty Signalling Committee; and whether, in view of this decision of the Admiralty, the Board of Trade propose to eliminate this code from the Board of Trade examinations and from the British Signal Manual.

THE EARL OF **GRANARD**: My Lords, I beg to inform the noble Lord, in reply to his Question, that it is not proposed to continue the Pyrotechnic Morse Code in the Navy. The Navy have found it of no use, and it has consequently been eliminated from their course. The British Signal Manual will be amended accordingly, and the Board of Trade do not intend to impose this form of signalling as a qualification for masters' and mates' certificates.

QUALIFICATION OF WOMEN (COUNTY AND TOWN COUNCILS (SCOTLAND) BILL [H.L.]

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

LORD **HAMILTON OF DALZELL**: My Lords, this Bill is the Scottish edition of the measure which was recently introduced into your Lordships' House by my noble friend the Lord President of the Council, and to which your Lordships accorded a Second Reading by a majority of eighty-eight votes—a majority which, I may remind the House, is altogether unusual in the case of a Bill which proceeds from this side. That Bill was so recently discussed here, and the principle which it involves has received such emphatic endorsement from your Lordships, that I feel sure it is not necessary for me to detain the House by any discussion of that principle; and I assume, as I hope I have the right to do, that your Lordships will show the same confidence in the women of Scotland as you have already shown in the women of England.

In Scotland women are at present entitled to sit upon parish councils and school boards, so that, allowing for the differences in the systems of the two countries, I think it may be said that their position in regard to local bodies is very similar. I must admit that the number of women occupying seats upon those bodies is not very considerable, but I think it is universally admitted that those ladies who have been selected to occupy these positions have uniformly done so with the greatest credit, and, in many cases, as in the instance given on Thursday by my noble friend Lord Courtney, with the very greatest distinction. The position of women in Scotland as electors of town and county councils is also broadly the same as it is in England. It may be asked, "Why, if there is so much similarity, is it necessary to have a separate Bill?" That has been thought desirable for two reasons, which I think are very sound ones—first, because the systems of local government in the two countries have been established under totally separate and distinct Acts of Parliament, from which it follows that the references necessary in a Bill of this kind will be much clearer and more explicit if only one set of Acts is referred to in each of the two Bills than would be the case if an attempt were made to deal with the subject in one Bill; and, secondly, because there are certain important differences between the methods of appointing the magistrates and the members of the licensing authorities in the two countries. It is not proposed under either of these Bills to do any more than remove from women the disqualification from sitting upon town and county councils, and it is not intended to qualify women to occupy seats upon the bench or upon the licensing courts. There are, of course, certain cases in which a man who is a member of a town or county council becomes a magistrate by virtue of his office; in England I believe there are only two such cases—where a man becomes a mayor of a town or chairman of a county council. Those two cases were covered in the English Bill as originally introduced by a clause of three lines, which provided that a woman, if elected as chairman of a county council or mayor of a borough, was not, by virtue of holding or having held that office, to be a justice of the peace. Your Lordships decided in Committee that you would not allow women to hold either of those offices, and that provision consequently became inoperative and was struck out of the Bill. There is in the present Bill a similar provision, and it will, of course, depend on the course which your Lordships take whether or not that provision is necessary.

In Scotland the case is not quite so simple as in England, and there remain to be dealt with the cases of the bailies and the members of the licensing authorities. As your Lordships know, the bailies or burgh magistrates are elected by the town council from among their own number, and the licensing and appeal courts consist either wholly or in part of burgh magistrates, justices of the peace, and members of the county council respectively. As it is not intended to empower women to occupy either of these positions the provisions which will be found in sub-clauses (*a*) and (*b*) of the first section of the Bill have been introduced. Sub-clause (*b*) also contains a provision that in case a woman is appointed as provost of a burgh an extra bailie shall be appointed during her term of office, the object of that provision being, of course, to prevent any diminution of the number of burgh magistrates as established by Statute. I think that, with the exceptions I have mentioned, this Bill is absolutely on all fours with the Bill to which your Lordships have already given a Second Reading; and it is, therefore, with some confidence that I ask the House to read this Bill a second time in order that the two measures may proceed together.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Hamilton of Dalzell.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

IMPORTED WATCH-CASES BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF GRANARD: My Lords, the necessity for this Bill has been brought about in a rather curious way. According to the Customs Act, 1842, all foreign plate imported into this country must be of the same standard as our own plate and must be hall-marked. For some reason the customs authorities have always considered that watch cases did not come within the meaning of the Act, and consequently up to the present time they have always been exempted from assay and marking. The result is that watch cases of all kinds have been brought into this country, and cases have been sold as gold and silver which were nothing of the sort. The Court of Appeal the other day ruled that watch cases were plate within the meaning of the Act, and the object of this Bill is to exempt from assay and hall-marking all watch cases which are at present in stock over here and which came into this country before 1st June last.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

THE TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES BILL.

THE DUKE OF BEDFORD: My Lords, I rise to ask the noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for War: (1) If he will lay upon the Table of the House a copy of the form of attestation for a man enlisting from the Militia into the Special Reserve under Clause 29 of the Territorial and Reserve Forces Act, and also a copy of the attestation form for a man enlisting in the proposed Territorial Army under Clause 8 of the Territorial and Reserve Forces Act; (2) What will be the rate of pay for the proposed Section A of the new Special Reserve, and the qualifications; (3) Will the enlistment for the new third battalions of the Special Reserve be county enlistment as at present for the Militia, or general enlistment as at present for the Army; (4) What was the total strength of officers and non-commissioned officers and men of all branches of the Volunteer Force on the 1st June, 1907.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of PORTSMOUTH): My Lords, the forms of attestation for a man enlisting from the Militia into the Special Reserve and for a man enlisting into the proposed Territorial Army are being prepared, and they will be laid upon the Table of your Lordships' House as soon as possible. Such forms embody a great amount of detail, and their wording must be perfectly explicit if we are to be fair to the men enlisting. The greatest care must therefore be exercised in their preparation. Some of the details necessarily depend upon the final shape of the Bill. The rate of pay for the proposed Section A of the Special Reserve is not yet definitely settled. The conditions will, generally speaking, be similar to those for Section A of the Regular Reserve, but the special qualifications, such as special efficiency in musketry, etc., have not yet been finally determined. The enlistment for the new third battalions of the Special Reserve will be, as now, as territorial as possible. But even in the case of the present Militia it is sometimes found necessary to enlarge the recruiting area of certain units. As to the total strength of officers and non-commissioned officers and men of all branches of the Volunteer Force on June 1, 1907, the numerical returns of Volunteers are only received quarterly at the War Office. The figures for the quarter ended June 30 are not yet quite ready. The figures for April last were: Officers, 8,735; men, 240,156; total, 248,891. These figures are for all arms, but they do not include the permanent staff. The total for officers which I have given includes quartermasters, medical and veterinary officers, and acting chaplains, but is exclusive of seconded officers.

THE DUKE OF BEDFORD: Am I to understand that there is no chance of seeing the attestation forms before the Report stage of the Bill is reached ?

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH : For the reasons I have given I am afraid not.

STATE OF PUBLIC BUSINESS.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN rose to call attention to the present state of public business in Parliament. The noble Earl said : My Lords, I venture to think that, being as we are in the middle of July, and things being as they are, your Lordships will not be surprised at having your attention directed to the present state of public business. So far as the session has gone the conduct of public business by the Government appears to me to be not only novel and strange, but entirely without precedent. The King's Speech is generally supposed to represent the deliberate intentions of His Majesty's Government with regard to the legislative proposals which are to be made during the session. Will anyone say that, looked at from this point of view, the King's Speech has in any way been carried out by the business which has been laid upon the Table of the two Houses ? Nearly all the principal Bills which were mentioned in the King's Speech have either not been introduced at all, or else, after being introduced, have been withdrawn. There is only one Bill—the Army Bill—which has been proceeded with, and it is the only measure of importance which has reached your Lordships' House.

The first Bill mentioned in the King's Speech is the Licensing Bill. Where is that Bill ? Who has ever seen it ? The noble Earl the Lord President was asked whether that measure would be introduced in this House, and he told us that as it was the Home Secretary's Bill he thought the right hon. Gentleman would prefer to introduce it himself in the other House. If the noble Earl had taken this House into his confidence he might have gone on to say that the Bill had not been agreed upon in the Cabinet, and, further, he might even have told us that the Bill was not in draft. The next Bill was the Irish Council Bill, which was for the purpose of further associating the people of Ireland with their domestic affairs. That Bill, indeed, was introduced, but an interval occurred ; there was a great meeting in Ireland, Mr. Redmond blew his trumpet, and down fell the walls of the Government Bill as flat as the walls of Jericho, and the Government did not venture even to propose that measure for a Second Reading in the House of Commons. My Lords, I question whether there is a parallel to this in the history of Parliament.

What was the next Bill ? The Irish University Bill. That, again, is another instance of unprecedented procedure. The late Chief Secretary for Ireland, who had just been appointed Ambassador to Washington, could not depart upon his new errand without giving in very full detail all the particulars of the Irish University Bill. Your Lordships will remember that his proposal was that Trinity College should be absorbed in a new University of Dublin. My Lords, where is that Bill ? Has anybody heard of it since ? What is the reason of its not being introduced, and, if it was not to be introduced, why did the late Chief Secretary make any mention of it before leaving this country ? There was another Bill called the Education (Special Religious Instruction) Bill. That Bill was not promised in the gracious Speech from the Throne, but it was introduced. Now it has been withdrawn. Why ? If it was to be withdrawn, why was it introduced ? I venture to say there is no instance, certainly none of which I have ever read or known, in which a Government absolutely departed from nearly all the important measures which they foreshadowed in the Speech from the Throne.

This failure in respect of these measures is undoubted. It is not denied. The Government admit it. What are the excuses for it, and who is to blame ? I think there is no source so authoritative to which one can apply as the Prime Minister, and I am going to trouble your Lordships, for reasons which I will give you presently, with the excuses which the Prime Minister has put forward for the failure of the Government in respect of their programme. There are two or three other Bills which were foreshadowed in the Speech and which have not been introduced, but they are of less importance, and I wish to concentrate your Lordships' attention on the more important part of the programme. The Prime Minister had to make excuses for his Government, and this is the general excuse he made on 3rd June—

> "Undoubtedly we have not dealt with some of the Bills we have undertaken to produce, and I do not hesitate to state that it was due to the long autumn session of last year. Undoubtedly there are great evils when the House is kept in active legislation up to the days immediately before Christmas. The draftsmen and officials are occupied in watching and assisting in correcting legislation, so that they cannot devote their attention to the Bills that should be ready for the next session."

Was it not certain that that would happen? The Prime Minister, with his great official experience, must have known as well as anybody that when he demanded that there should be an autumn session, which, necessarily, was very prolonged with the important Education Bill for consideration, it implied a great waste of time and of energy on the part not only of the draftsmen but of His Majesty's Ministers. If he did not know it he was warned most specifically in both Houses of Parliament that that would be the case. Let me read what my noble friend who leads the Opposition in your Lordships' House said on the subject. The noble Marquess said—

> "To my mind, the only serious objection to an autumn session is that it encroaches upon the one period of the year when hard-worked Ministers and hard-worked public officers are able to devote themselves steadily and without interruption to the preparation of the measures which have to be considered in Parliament in the following year."

The noble Marquess saw that that would not only be felt by the draftsmen but by the Ministers themselves, and that its consequences would be reflected on the legislation of the next year.

Well, what is the excuse for not introducing the Licensing Bill? This is what the Prime Minister said—

> "The first measure mentioned in the Speech was a Bill for the reform of licensing, and the fact that it occupies the first place is the proof of our earnestness—

he might have added "the only proof"—

> "and of our desire to proceed with it, with as little delay as possible. But this is precisely one of those measures which have suffered from the autumn session. The introduction of this Bill has been so long delayed that although very great progress has been made in sketching a number of provisions which might be constituted into a Bill, it has been practically crowded out this session. I promise that this shall be the very first measure of next session."

It is quite clear from that excuse what has happened. Progress has been made, we are told, in "sketching a number of provisions which might be constituted into a Bill." Your Lordships will observe that it is not the tired draftsmen who are in fault on this occasion; it is the tired Ministers who either have not had time to consider the matter in the Cabinet, or else have difficulty about it and have been unable to prepare a measure. Those who are very anxious in the cause of temperance have naturally pressed their request very urgently on the Prime Minister that a Bill should be introduced, and he has endeavoured to soothe them with these words—

> "I wish that we could have seen our way to passing a thoroughly good Licensing Bill. That is what I hoped—what, indeed, I promised—but it was impossible. I admit that we overestimated our powers, but the Bill which will see light next year will be a better Bill and a more effectual Bill than we could have submitted this year."

Let us take the next Bill—the Irish Council Bill. Why has that Bill been so suddenly withdrawn, and what is the result? The Prime Minister said at Plymouth on 7th June—

> "We took what steps we could to ascertain Irish feeling, and we had good reason to believe that our Bill would receive a most favourable reception, but the moment we were undeceived, of course it was all over. A measure which was pronounced to be out of accord with the wishes and ideas of the Irish people was not a measure which the Liberal Government could proceed with, and therefore, although with regret and reluctance, we had to abandon it."

Mr. Birrell, the present Chief Secretary, gave a slightly different version. He said—

> "I was certainly disappointed and surprised; but betrayed, I distinctly was not."

Now, what is important to Parliament is not who was or was not betrayed; what is important to Parliament is that this Government introduced an Irish measure which they very shortly found was an entirely mistaken measure and in no way in harmony with Irish feeling and which they were compelled to withdraw. I would point out that that is a capital blunder for a Government to make. They said they had good reason to believe the Bill would be well received. Good reason from whom? Who told them that their measure would be well received? I think that very likely even some of those who sit on this side of the House might enlighten them as to one of the reasons why the Bill was not well received, and that was that, among other things, they proposed to confer upon this Irish Council authority over education. Your Lordships well know that the Irish hierarchy will never, if they can avoid it, allow education to pass into lay hands; and although we did not hear much of them in connection with the opposition to this Bill, yet depend upon it their special representatives in Parliament opposed this Bill most bitterly.

Mr. Birrell says he was not betrayed. Well, Mr. Birrell is a very peculiar Minister. There is one theme which seems to be occurring to him continually, and that is his legislative misfortunes. Mr. Birrell cannot go to any public function without explaining his legislative misfortunes. If for the word "misfortunes" he had substituted "want of success," then I think we should all have been able to agree with him. But his reasons are most peculiar. At the Canadian dinner he said—

> "Reference has been made to the somewhat short lives of my statutory efforts as compared with my books. My books are my own; my Bills are the result of other people's labours."

I only hope, from regard for my noble friend on the Front Ministerial Bench who is now leading the House, that he, at all events, did not assist Mr. Birrell in the composition of these Bills. I am sure that we all expect and believe that when we get anything from him it will be something which is more likely to pass. Mr. Birrell went on to say—

> "If I were only allowed, like the Secretary of State for India, to be somewhat of an autocrat, my legislative efforts would live far longer than my books."

I think that is very probable. But those words have this true Radical ring—Make me an autocrat and then I will carry such legislation as I choose, and I will teach the people what is for the people's good, even though they may be foolish enough not altogether to agree with me. That is not only Mr. Birrell's position. It is, as we all know, the position of the Prime Minister. His idea of a mode l Parliament is a Parliament in which the Prime Minister of the day, being possessed of a majority, is to have absolute and uncontrolled power to pass any legislation he likes into law without any hindrance or delay from any other persons or bodies whatever.

Then there is the Irish University Bill. Why has that Bill not been introduced? Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman says—

> "No practical results can be expected to follow from the introduction during the present session of a Bill of that magnitude. During the autumn recess the Chief Secretary purposes, in Ireland, to devote time and personal attention to this question, and my right hon. friend, whom we know to be of a cheerful, even sanguine disposition, believes that it is possible and even likely that there may be established or discovered a harmony among the jarring interests and opinions on the subject in Ireland.

If this is so, if the Chief Secretary is going to inquire into this matter in the coming autumn, what was the reason for inserting this Bill in the King's Speech; and, being in the King's Speech, why is it not being gone on with? Mr. Birrell does not quite agree on this point with the Prime Minister, because he tells us very clearly that we are going to have no University Bill next year. Mr. Birrell says—

> "The Roman Catholics and the representatives of Presbyterians acquiesced in Mr. Bryce's scheme, and he was therefore entitled to put it forward. Whether Mr. Bryce was altogether wise in entering into the details, as he did, was another matter altogether."

Can your Lordships imagine that one Minister just quitting office should make a long speech giving all the details of a Bill which is to be brought in without having obtained the consent of the Minister who was going to succeed him? To me that seems a very strange state of things. Mr. Birrell, referring to what chance there would be of securing a solution in the next session of Parliament, said—

> "The next session does not occupy a very cheerful position to an eager legislator who wishes to see himself immortalised in the Statute Book. Matters of great importance will be before the House, and there are certain forces and elements in my own Party which lead me to ask what chance there is of the Government being able next session to solve this question unless they have at all events done their very best to come to something like a friendly conclusion upon it."

It is quite clear from that statement what the position of affairs is in the Party.

The Nonconformists are opposed to endowing a Roman Catholic university or college, and that is the difficulty which has prevented the introduction of this Bill, and which probably will prevent its introduction in the next session of Parliament.

Now to revert to Mr. McKenna's Bill, which has been dropped. Why, I ask, was it introduced? I should be very curious to know the object of introducing a Bill of that kind if you were not going to persevere with it. The Prime Minister said on 3rd June—

> "The Government, after much hesitation, and much regret in many respects, have determined that it is not desirable to go further with this measure. The course of business and the prospects of next session have been considerably modified since this Bill was introduced, and we see our way to propose that we should undertake next session the great task of putting the educational system of the country in order. We shall deal with this question on broad lines, which will be our own lines."

That is a year hence, and many things may happen before that time. What, I ask, was the object of introducing this small Bill if you had made up your minds that you were going to deal with the whole question?

I must apologise for having read so many extracts, but I desired that it should be clearly understood both in your Lordships' House and elsewhere to whom this undoubted failure is unquestionably due. I have quoted the words of the Prime Minister and of Mr. Birrell for the purpose of showing, as I think their words have shown, that this failure proceeds from the blunders of His Majesty's Government, and His Majesty's Government alone. The members of this Government pride themselves very much on being clear thinkers, but with reference to the Bills I have mentioned the question is, Have they thought at all? I am inclined to doubt it, and I will tell your Lordships why. There was another Bill—the English Valuation Bill—promised in the Speech from the Throne. Why was that Bill not introduced? This is what the Prime Minister says with regard to it—

> "As to valuation in England and Wales, I may be allowed to remark that this is not so simple or straightforward a matter as in Scotland. In England the machinery and assessment system are complicated and defective. . . . I would only say that this makes it, of course, difficult to speak positively as to the introduction of this Bill and its passing into law during the present session."

What person is there who has the slightest knowledge of local business in England who does not know that the system of assessment is complicated and defective? Has the Prime Minister and have the Government made that discovery for the first time, or, if they knew it before, why did they promise a Bill on the subject this session?

The Government need not try to shift the responsibility for these failures on to any other shoulders. The favourite device of the Prime Minister when in a difficulty is to draw a herring across the trail, and he generally does it by attributing the failure to your Lordships' House. He did it only the other day. The Welsh Members who support Disestablishment for Wales are by no means pleased that temperance reformers and educationists have got before them, and they waited upon the Prime Minister and asked when he was going to introduce a Welsh Disestablishment Bill. The Prime Minister, in his reply, said very little about Welsh Disestablishment, but, alluding to your Lordships' House, he said—

> "Think of that House; that is what prevents me bringing in these Bills."

In what way your Lordships are in anticipation to be blamed in this matter passes my wit to understand. The programme of legislation which was promised by the Government at the beginning of this session was altogether too ambitious. Do not let it be supposed that this is merely the observation of one who is politically opposed to noble Lords opposite. Let me quote the *Daily Chronicle*, which, after all, is not unfriendly to His Majesty's Government. With reference to the withdrawal of Bills just after the Whitsuntide recess, this newspaper said—

> "The King's Speech was very much overloaded. It was not a sessional programme at all; it was more like a Newcastle programme. The spinning of such programmes at large in Speeches from the Throne is a pastime in which all Governments are wont to indulge, but it is of very doubtful expediency."

The Prime Minister and the Government received another warning from the noble Earl (Lord Rosebery) who sits on the cross benches. Addressing a meeting of the Liberal Imperial League, of which several of His Majesty's Ministers are members, the noble Earl said—

> "My fear is that the Government may make too many impossible promises and so provoke inevitable disappointment and reaction. It is not possible to effect too much at a time. The Government has pledged itself to the impossible this year. Do any of you who have had experience of Parliament believe that any such programme as this is possible or is likely to end in anything but disappointment and reaction?"

The noble Earl never said truer words in his life. As we have seen, there is plenty of disappointment; whether or not there is going to be any reaction is a matter for the future. The fact is, the Government Party is a divided Party, and is split into several portions. By repeating over and over again that they are more solid and harmonious than ever the Prime Minister thinks he will prove what he desires to prove; but what is the use of speaking in that way in face of such facts as the recent by-election at Jarrow? There you had the Irish Party, who are presumably part of the Liberal Party, and also the Labour Party opposing the official Liberal candidate. Their one anxiety was that the official Liberal candidate should not get in, and the Irish candidate has since boasted that at all events he taught His Majesty's Government a good lesson.

So much for legislation up to the present time. Now let us take this House. What Bills have we had? The earliest Bill was only introduced the other day—I refer to the Bill making women eligible to sit on county and borough councils. The noble Marquess who leads the House, and who, I regret, is not present to-day, was asked why that Bill was not introduced three or four months before, and he gave no answer at all. All he said was that for his part he would not care to introduce any Bill in your Lordships' House. That Bill is proceeding. With regard to the Army Bill, which has passed through some of its stages here, we know that there was considerable discussion and a great deal of closure in the other House. That Bill, I will undertake to say, was not examined in the other House with anything like the accuracy and thoroughness with which it has been examined in your Lordships' House. We have in this House a number of commanding officers of Militia and Yeomanry who are second to none in their knowledge both of the principle and the detail of the management of those forces, and some of them took perhaps the rather unusual, but very effectual, course of writing out catechisms for my noble friend the Under-Secretary, and I will undertake to say that the noble Earl is very much obliged to them.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: Hear, hear!

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: That course certainly enabled an amount of information to be added to the noble Earl's previous knowledge of the Bill, and the detailed information which he has given in reply to my noble friends has been of the greatest possible value to this House and I believe also to the Army. What has been the result so far of the discussions on that Bill? It is that in the opinion of your Lordships' House the Bill is a great experiment, and that it is doubtful whether you will be successful in getting the men. With regard to the cost, it is conclusively proved that the Government have never made any estimate, and even now have not the faintest conception what the cost will be; and with reference to some of the details, it is clear that if the Government do not make more changes their scheme will break down. There are further stages of this Bill, and no doubt further valuable information will be imparted to the House, but with regard to the scheme itself this House has no intention whatever of shifting the responsibility for the Army Bill from the Government. Their scheme it is, and whether it is a success or failure will rest with them.

Now what Bills are coming up to this House, and when will they arrive? That is a point on which I am sure we are all anxious for information. I trust that we are not going to have a repetition of what happened in 1906, though I greatly fear that we are. Let me remind your Lordships what happened in 1906. In the first days of August the Education Bill was brought up to this House, and the House agreed to an autumn session for the special consideration of that measure. The noble Lord could give us no definite information as to what other Bills would be taken. The Government were asked especially whether they intended to forward the Land Tenure Bill, which was at the time a private Member's Bill in the other House. They could give no answer. They never alluded to the Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill, also a private Member's Bill, which in October or November they took up. The result was that during the last days of the consideration of the Education Bill there came up a succession of important Bills from the other House.

There was the Trade Disputes Bill. That was a most important Bill, and it is unnecessary for me to say anything further about it except this, that it was a Bill which was disliked originally and opposed by the Law Officers in the other House of Parliament, and with the exception of my noble and learned friend on the Woolsack, who told us he had always been in favour of the Bill as it subsequently came up to this House, the lawyers in the Cabinet had declared against it. What happened? That Bill was read here a second time on 4th December, and it was finally passed, practically without alteration, on 14th December. Next came the Land Tenure Bill, which the Government did not finally decide to take up until the month of October. That Bill altered the tenure of land in England and Scotland. It is true that it left out of consideration many material changes, but that was the effect of it. That Bill was read a second time on 5th December, and we passed it on 19th December. The next was the Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill, which had also been a private Member's Bill, and which altered the whole position of town tenants. That Bill was read a second time in this House on 6th December, and passed on 18th December. Then there was the Workmen's Compensation Bill, which was read a second time on 14th December and passed on 19th December. And finally there was the Education (Provision of Meals) Bill, which involved a very important principle, and would have been fully discussed by your Lordships if there had been time. We read that Bill a second time on 19th December and passed it on 20th December. There were, therefore, five important Bills involving weighty principles which your Lordships took up after the beginning of the month of December and at the end of an adjourned session, and this House decided to pass every one of those Bills. I hope that when the Prime Minister and noble Lords opposite speak upon this question they will remember that in the year 1906, at the end of an adjourned session, your Lordships passed with very slight notice indeed, and with very little consideration, no less than five Bills involving most important principles; and yet this House is said to be entirely hostile to every measure brought forward by a Liberal Government. The Return which, on my Motion, was ordered to be printed on 6th May last, proves that in the year 1906 this House passed more important measures in less time and with less consideration than at any time during the preceding twenty years.

I trust we shall receive some information as to the Bills that are going to be brought up to us during the remaining weeks of the session. It is quite safe to say that whatever Bills come up will be in a very sorry condition. Owing to the alteration which has been made in the whole course of business in the other House, Bills of importance do not now go through Committee of the Whole House. They are sent to a Grand Committee, where there is no record of the proceedings except short accounts in the newspapers, and the feature of which is the enforcement by the Government of the closure. The Grand Committee system and the liberal use of the closure, therefore, place on your Lordships' House the duty of a more thorough and more critical examination of Bills.

I wonder whether any representation has been made to the Cabinet with regard to this House and the business which is to be brought before it. The noble Marquess the Leader of the House has often said that he desires to uphold the dignity of the House. We are all certain that in intention the noble Marquess does so desire, but what I want to know is, Has he or anybody else made any representation in the Cabinet as to the position of this House with regard to legislation? Has he pointed out that, in ordinary fairness to your Lordships, Bills ought to be brought up here in time to enable them to be fully and thoroughly considered? The Prime Minister says that he is not an extreme revolutionary, but that he has no dislike to formidable changes. I do not know exactly where the distinction between those two epithets would be drawn, but even formidable

The Earl of Camperdown.

changes surely are of sufficient importance to require that they should be thoroughly examined into in this House of Parliament, at all events, if they had not been in the other. I apologise to your Lordships for having detained you so long. I feel that we have a right to hear some statement from the Government as to the Bills which are going to be submitted to your Lordships' House in the remaining portion of the session, and I hope the noble Earl will not do two things—in the first place, that he will not attempt in any way to minimise the importance of the changes which the Bills that are likely to come up involve; and, in the second place, that he will not forget that your Lordships have a right to due and full consideration at the hands of His Majesty's Government.

*LORD RIBBLESDALE: My Lords, I confess I am a little surprised at the line of argument adopted by the noble Earl in view of the terms of his notice. We have heard very little from him about public business, but a great deal about the public and party responsibilities of His Majesty's Government. Under a sort of sheltering screen of suitable extracts from speeches of His Majesty's Ministers on all sorts of different occasions and at different places, and assisted by one extract from the *Daily Chroncile*, the noble Earl has made a general attack upon His Majesty's Government. He began his speech by saying that the conduct of its business by His Majesty's Government was novel, strange, and without precedent. If I had not listened to observations on nearly thirty Speeches from the Throne in this House I might say what uncomfortable words are these. But I confess that, having heard statements from both Parties when in opposition as to how far Ministers have discharged promises given in the Speech from the Throne, I was not very much startled by hearing them again.

When the noble Earl really did come to the business of the House, I must say I was much in agreement with a good deal of what he said. But I regret that he couched his observations on distinctly Party lines, because my own idea is that all your Lordships are interested in this question, not as Liberals or Unionists, but as ordinary practical men of business concerned in the efficient and decorous discharge of our duties as members of a branch of the Legislature. The noble Earl stated that one of the mistakes which the Government had made in its novel and fantastic conduct of business was that more measures were not initiated here.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: I did not say that, but I do not mind the noble Lord taking the point.

*LORD RIBBLESDALE: The noble Lord did say something about the initiation of measures here, and on that I should like to observe that your Lordships can hardly expect, things being as they are, to use the phrase adopted by the noble Earl, to see measures initiated in this House, especially measures of a Party complexion or involving questions that would be likely to give rise to Party controversy on matters of principle. It is quite clear that on some points the Bills would be sent down to the other House containing Amendments—possibly wise and improving Amendments—and in a form quite different from what His Majesty's Government had led the electorate to expect would be passed. There would thus be no saving of time, because the Bills would be sent back to your Lordships, leading in the end to a lot of bother.

I would like to give your Lordships from my own experience an illustration of the improprieties to which the noble Earl has called our attention as regards the hurrying through of Bills in this House at the end of a session. I will take your Lordships no further back than 3rd August, 1906. On that day I was asked to take charge of the Local Government (Ireland) Act (1898) Amendment Bill, Lord Denman, who was representing the Irish Office in your Lordships' House, being absent serving with the Yeomanry in a pleasant southern county at the time. The Bill was passed through all its stages without even being printed or circulated. It dealt with a readjustment of county and city boundaries and with a rateable adjustment. Both Leaders in your Lordships' House took part in the debate; it was eagerly discussed at every stage by the occupants of both Front Benches, and with a slight interval for refreshment, during which I went to consult Mr.

Cherry, whom I had not seen before, it passed through all its stages in about twenty-five minutes of Parliamentary time.

What happened was this. An Irish Member of Parliament of the old-fashioned Nationalist sort came to me in great agitation. He thrust a few manuscript letters in my hand, gave me a rather bewildering idea of the points at issue, and left hurriedly for Euston and Holyhead. What followed was worthy of "Iolanthe" and of Gilbert and Sullivan's insight into the way we manage our public affairs. I had been told that it was an unopposed Bill, but that turned out not to be the case. I began badly, because I said that the bridge was at Kilkenny, and Lord Ashbourne, whom I do not see in his place to-day, at once got up and told me he thought I must be under some misapprehension, because the bridge was at Waterford. Having an ear untrained to Irish geographical exactitudes I thought I had made a mistake, and I at once sent a fleet messenger to hale Mr. Cherry here to enlighten me further. He came to the Throne, and though he encouraged me with occasional gestures they were such as I did not understand, and, at the suggestion of my noble friend the Lord President, the proceedings were adjourned so that I could learn more about the Bill. But, whatever the details of the measure were, I had to face the music played in varying cadences but with equal clemency towards myself by Lord Ashbourne and Lord Salisbury. Lord Ashbourne, in the course of the proceedings, remembered that there had been a great fight at Kilkenny over a bridge, and from having been a critic he became an unexpected ally. He said he remembered the bridge well. It was, he declared, more like a corkscrew than a bridge, and he proceeded to describe the vicissitudes which traffic had to undergo in crossing it and which would have entitled it to a place in the most troublesome part of the Pilgrim's Progress. In this case, perhaps, *de minimis non curat lex*, and no great harm was done.

I agree that the Legislative machine must learn to stand sudden tests of urgency. But given the urgency, which was the plea in this particular case, I submit that in all essentials very much the same thing must have happened at that time, that is on the lees of the session, had it been a Bill, let us say, for defining where the responsibility of the occupier or owner begins and that of the executive ceases in the protection of grazing lands from cattle drives—a Bill which, in view of the serious condition of parts of Ireland in this respect, a serious condition which to my mind has been fully recognised by His Majesty's Government, and also in view of Mr. Birrell's rather enigmatic reply to a question on the condition of affairs which was given some weeks ago in another place, is not altogether of a hypothetical character, and which would, perforce, introduce novel conditions and possibly new interpretations of the existing law. It might by just reason of urgency have been closured in the House of Commons and forced through in the last days of the session here; and I think I need not further labour the inconvenience, to put it gently, of such a proceeding.

To tighten up a little what I have to say, and to make room for others, it may easily occur that a measure may be closured in the House of Commons and forced through this House on perfectly just and reasonable grounds of public need and urgency. But it may also be that a measure may be so closured and forced through here at the instance of Party shifts and exigencies. This, I submit, is a bad state of things. If the Resolution relating to this House which was recently affirmed by a very large majority in another place ever passes into law, it is quite clear that our position as a branch of the Legislature will be most materially altered. But until that does occur I believe that we, as business men anxious to do our duty, will do well to see whether something cannot be done which will reasonably and effectually mitigate the disorders to which my noble friend Lord Camperdown, in his able speech, has drawn our attention.

*THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, I was rather in hopes that somebody would have risen from the other side of the House to continue this discussion. Our attenuated Benches cannot supply the same force of speakers as those opposite, and I had hoped that, if this discussion was to continue at all, some noble Lord opposite might have proceeded.

We must all agree, I think, that my noble friend Lord Camperdown has made a very interesting speech, although, as was pointed out by my noble friend behind me, it by no means exclusively dealt with the notice which he had placed on the Paper. It was, I think, thirty-one minutes by the clock before he had even mentioned the business of the House, the whole of the earlier part of his speech being directed to a very clear, forcible, and, I have no doubt, to noble Lords opposite convincing, exposure of the general policy of His Majesty's Government. The noble Earl showed a singular anxiety to see certain measures which, although mentioned in the King's Speech, have not yet been presented in the form of Bills, particularly I think the Licensing Bill. We shall note the noble Earl's anxiety and we hope, as my right hon. friend the Prime Minister said, to be able to satisfy it at an early date next year.

Then the noble Earl made a particular point of the withdrawal of the Irish Council Bill. I entirely adhere to the explanation of that withdrawal which was given by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. In introducing a measure dealing with so controversial a subject as Irish Government, it is absolutely impossible to foretell the precise reception which such a Bill will obtain, and when we found that those whom we had hoped to benefit and to satisfy—and whom, as I believe, our measure would have benefited and might have satisfied—would not be satisfied, it would have been a serious waste of Parliamentary time to have proceeded with that measure. But, my Lords, is this the first occasion on which measures have been introduced and withdrawn? I seem to recollect various adventures of noble Lords opposite into the region of education before they were able to arrive at the Act of 1902.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: But were they withdrawn before the Second Reading?

*THE EARL OF CREWE: One, I think was not read a second time. At any rate, the first never reached this House at all, and the second, I think, was withdrawn here, but I am speaking only from memory. On the licensing question, too, I am not quite certain that some attempt was not made to deal with it before the measure of 1903. The earlier part of the noble Earl's speech was directed solely to questions of policy. He made a point, which I fully admit, that various measures were included in the King's Speech with which we have not found it possible to proceed. I admit that, and I regret it. The noble Earl used the phrase that we were too ambitious. I will accept that epithet, but that is by no means a new crime with Governments. If the noble Earl will look back to previous Speeches from the Throne he will find over and over again that there is a great difference between what is promised and what is performed.

When noble Lords opposite were in office, within the last two years it was the fact that out of twelve measures mentioned in the King's Speech only three were passed into law. Therefore though I lament the fact, it cannot be said to be a new fact and one due to any special iniquity on our part. Then my noble friend went on to imply that the Prime Minister had accused your Lordships of throwing out measures which had never reached this House at all, and that your Lordships were responsible in some way for the non-introduction of certain measures. I am afraid that is so. It is not difficult, particularly when a measure has been considered in another place, to foresee the reception which it will get at your Lordship's hands. As last session proceeded, we were able, I think with perfect certainty and confidence, to foresee the fate of the different Government measures by the time they left the other House. If we had made a forecast of what the fate of the different measures would have been at your Lordships' hands I can say positively that it would have been an absolutely correct one.

Then my noble friend went on to speak of the last autumn session. With all that the noble Earl said on the subject of autumn sessions generally I heartily agree. They are bad things—bad for Ministers, and not good for permanent officials or draftsmen. On that account we have decided, under, I admit, difficult circumstances, not to hold an autumn session this year. But, again, we are not the only people who have held autumn sessions. In 1902 no important measure except the Finance Bill came up to your Lordships' House during the summer session, and then, as the House will remember, an autumn session was held at which important measures, such as the Education Bill of that year and the London Water Bill were passed. As to the autumn session of last year, does my noble friend consider that the measures of last autumn were not adequately discussed in this House? If he thinks so all I can say is that I hold an entirely different opinion. Nobody can say that the Education Bill of last autumn was not fully debated.

What were the other important measures? There was the Trade Disputes Bill, which received all the discussion your Lordships desired to give it. As we know, there were strong differences of opinion about it on the other side of the House, or, at any rate, differences of opinion as to whether it ought to be allowed to pass. Those differences were most fully and clearly expressed, and I do not know that your Lordships required any further time to deal with it. The Workmen's Compensation Act I certainly thought received all the discussion which your Lordships needed to give to it, and I do not think complaint was made at the time that any of its provisions had not been adequately discussed. The Plural Voting Bill, as we know, received an extremely short shrift, but that Bill your Lordships did not desire to discuss. Therefore I do not see what the burden of my noble friend's charge is. If this is an indictment against autumn sessions in present circumstances, I am with him; but I cannot admit that the particular Bills which came up last year did not receive a full and fair modicum of discussion.

My study of the Return for which my noble friend moved at the end of February leads me to think that as between parties in this House there is not much subject for mutual recrimination; I do not know that there is very much to choose between us. And therefore when I mention cases in which measures have come up late to this House, and have been discussed for a short number of days, I do not wish noble Lords opposite to think I am attacking them. I am simply defending ourselves from the attack brought against us by the noble Earl, because the noble Earl said nothing whatever in the course of his speech to indicate that he regarded this as a common offence or common misfortune, but he confined himself simply and solely to our policy and our proceedings.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: What I said was that in the year 1906 this House passed more important measures with less discussion, and in a shorter time, than in any other year that I could find in this Return; and the various stages of the Bills which the noble Earl has been speaking of followed one another as a rule at about a day's distance apart.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I think the noble Earl is inaccurate there. I am under the impression that we gave a fortnight to the different stages of the Education (Provision of Meals) Bill.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: That was not so. The Bill was read a second time on 19th December, and we took the Committee Stage on 20th December. The Report Stage and the Third Reading were also taken on the 20th.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: But I do not know that there were any outstanding points.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The noble Earl would hardly argue the Bill with the Opposition on the Report Stage, because there was no chance of the Bill passing if we had made any change whatever in it.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I do not think the noble Marquess stated any change that he desired to make. I admit, however, that on that point I am speaking from memory. I repeat that I do not see that as between the different parties there is very much to be said in point of lateness or in point of duration of discussion. My noble friend paid a rather left-handed compliment to your Lordships in saying that last year's Bills were passed without consideration. I thought they received very full and adequate consideration. I look at the noble Earl's Return and find that in 1900 the important Bill of the year was the Companies Bill, and it reached your Lordships' House on 31st July. In 1901 no Bill except the Finance Bill reached this House before 1st August.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: But there were no important Bills.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: There was the Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill—a Bill of 168 clauses—and it was discussed in your Lordships' House in one day.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: I beg to ask the noble Earl's pardon. I was in error.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: And it was by no means only a Consolidation Bill, for it contained a very considerable amount of new matter. The important Bills in 1902 came before your Lordships in the autumn session. In 1903 the Irish Land Bill was read the first time in this House on July 23rd. Two other important measures of the session, the Employment of Children Bill and the Sugar Convention, were read the first time on August 3rd and August 7th respectively. In 1904 the Licensing Bill came up to your Lordships' House and was read the first time on July 29th. The Local Authorities Default (Education) Bill, an exceedingly important measure, was read the first time on August 10th; and the Shop Hours Bill was read the first time on August 11. The Anglo-French Convention, a matter of the very first importance, was discussed in this House on August 12th. Then in 1905 the Aliens Bill came up on July 20th, and the Churches (Scotland) Bill on July 27th.

This year we have done better than that. Your Lordships have already got at any rate deep into the Territorial Forces Bill, and you have, as I hope, practically passed the Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) Bill. Those measures are in a perfectly happy position as regards your Lordships' House. Then, as regards the measures in another place, the Finance Bill is awaiting Report, and I hope will come up to your Lordships' House before very long. The Patents Bill and the Court of Criminal Appeal Bill, two important measures which I am glad to think are neither of them of a very controversial character, although I know the latter contains some controversial points, are also awaiting Report in another place, and I hope they will be here before very long. The Small Holdings Bill and the Small Landowners (Scotland) Bill, which, no doubt, are both measures containing very definite elements of controversy, are well advanced in Grand Committee in the other House. The Valuation (Scotland) Bill and the Evicted Tenants Bill are awaiting Committee, and they may be among the last measures to come before your Lordships. That accounts for all the measures that were mentioned by the Prime Minister in another place at the beginning of last month, and those are the measures which in due course will come before your Lordships' House.

In considering the question of the time at which measures reach this House it is important to remember that a measure may be extremely controversial without being complex. On both sides your Lordships have had to complain that measures of a complex character were brought up too late to receive adequate consideration; but whether a Bill is brought up in the middle of June or in the middle of August is not a matter of great importance if your Lordships dislike the principle of the measure and decide not to allow it to proceed. I think I have dealt with the various points that have been raised. I can assure my noble friend that I am very far indeed from denying the controversial character of some parts of certainly four of the measures which we still propose to bring before your Lordships; and I can assure him, speaking, as I am sure he will give me credit for doing, with the most absolute honesty, that I do not think it is at all reasonable to ask your Lordships to consider measures of any difficulty or complexity without giving very fair and reasonable time for doing so. That is, after all, what we are here for—to give a perfectly full and adequate discussion to measures; and certainly my noble friend will never hear from me a word which would lead him to think that I hold a different opinion from what he does on that point.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, the concluding words of the noble Earl were certainly words that we were glad to hear from his mouth. I am afraid they were the only words contained in his long speech which administered a grain of comfort to us on this side. It is quite possible, I think, that before the session ends we may have to remind the noble Earl of those words and to claim the fulfilment, I will not say of a pledge, but of the personal view that he has so distinctly expressed.

I have more than once endeavoured to plead the cause which my noble friend Lord Camperdown has made his own this evening, but I do not think I have ever had so strong a case as that which he has put before you, and I must say that the time seems to me to have come when this House should no longer be content with the *rôle* of defendant which is generally assigned to it, and that we should institute a cross-action of our own in which we should appear as the plaintiffs and noble Lords opposite as the defendants.

What is the situation which confronts us? We are told—I do not know on what inspiration, but I see it constantly stated—that there is no intention of prolonging the session far into the autumn. We are also told positively that there is to be no autumn session. As to that, I certainly applaud the decision of His Majesty's Government for the reasons stated by my noble friend. I think it quite conceivable that with a better distribution of Parliamentary time than that which now obtains autumn sessions may become a usual arrangement. But, after a session which has lasted from February until some indefinite time in the autumn months, to call Parliament again in October or November would seem to me to be the height of folly.

Nineteen working weeks of the session, so far as I can calculate, are now passed, and, adopting the usual anticipation, some six weeks remain. I do not think His Majesty's Government are to be congratulated on the account which they are able to give of their stewardship during those nineteen weeks. The noble Earl seemed to think that we are fortunate in the number of Government Bills which have already reached this House. But how do we stand? Only two measures of any importance have reached us. The noble Earl tells us that the Finance Bill, the Patents Bill, and the Criminal Appeal Bill await report, and that the Small Holdings Bill for England is well advanced—by that, I think, he means in the Committee-room upstairs, for it has not been discussed in detail in the House itself; and the same may be said of the Scottish Small Holdings Bill. Then the Scottish Valuation Bill is awaiting Committee, and so is that dealing with evicted tenants in Ireland. Does it not, then, come to this, that this long series of Bills is likely to be forced upon this House during the last two or three weeks of the session; and is it possible that in such circumstances those Bills should receive the full discussion which they demand?

The noble Earl suggested that there were some Bills which were controversial but not complex. Does he seriously suggest that Bills like the English Small Holdings Bill, or the Scottish Small Holdings Bill, or the Evicted Tenants Bill are not complex measures? They abound with proposals which are not only controversial but of the most complicated character, and which require minute and prolonged examination. Well, my Lords, what alternative remains? His Majesty's Government may lighten the ship and abandon some of the Bills, but a recent speech of the Prime Minister gave us to understand that nothing was further from his intention. The Prime Minister on that occasion was speaking in "Ercles' vien, a tyrant's vein," and he announced that not one of his measures was he likely to give up. So if we sit till even September we cannot escape from an indecent and scrambling mode of debating these important Bills.

What was the reply of the Lord President? It was the old *tu quoque* argument — you have done the same thing. The *tu quoque* argument is never a very convincing argument upon the merits. But, with all respect to the noble Earl, the *tu quoque* argument in this case does not hold good. The conditions are entirely different from those which obtained in those years when we from that side of the House pressed certain measures through Parliament in the last days of the session. In the first place, the congestion of legislation is far greater now than it was then. There are more important and controversial measures on the Table of the House than there were then; but what is more important still is that in the interim discussion in Committee of the House of Commons, as we used to understand it, has virtually ceased to exist.

I cannot insist too much upon what I venture to call the educative effect of those discussions in Committee. They were well reported in the Press; they kept the public fully informed; and the result was that important provisions—detailed provisions, perhaps, but yet important in principle—underwent in Committee a process of winnowing and sifting so complete that an unsound proposal was half dead before it was brought to your Lordships' House. All that has ceased now, and the result is that at the end of the session we have thrown at our heads a great mass of crude, undigested legislative matter which we have to deal with as best we may in the scramble of the last weeks, or days, or hours of the session. The gravity of the case is added to owing to the persistent refusal of Ministers to introduce Bills in this House. My noble friend Lord Ribblesdale said a word upon that subject. It did not seem to him that anything would be gained by introducing Bills into this House; for he said the Bills would go down into the other House from this House in a different form from that in which they had been introduced, that there would be a lot of bother, and no saving of time.

LORD RIBBLESDALE: I said they might go down.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I will not quarrel with my noble friend's description; but what I would point out to him is that if there had been a lot of bother, we should, at any rate, have had the opportunity of placing our views before the public and of obtaining for them full and adequate consideration. And if it did so happen that a Bill was amended or altered in this House it would always be open to the Commons, when the Bill reached them, to deal with our Amendments in such manner as they might think fit.

The question which we have to consider is how long this condition of things is to be tolerated by your Lordships' House. I say that in all seriousness, because, even if it be the case that noble Lords who sit on that Bench and those who sit on this Bench are tarred with the same brush, I feel sure that the time will come when the body of this House, the rank and file of this House, who are not members of the two Front Benches, will refuse any longer to submit to the kind of treatment in which we are expected to acquiesce. The treatment of this House is doubly unfair, because, on the one hand, you refuse us the opportunities, to which we are entitled, of discussing your Bills, and, on the other, you charge us with your failure when you bungle your legislation, as you have done this year, and are unable to make good the expectations which you have held out to the public and to Parliament.

Your Lordships have before you the Return moved by my noble friend Lord Camperdown; and I challenge contradiction when I say that, if you will look at the legislation which emanated from this House during the concluding weeks of the session of last year, you will find that not only was this House not reluctant to facilitate the passage of Government Bills, but that we went unusual lengths in order to pass those Bills into law. The noble Earl the Lord President seemed to think that we had ample time to examine all those Bills; but if you take the dates given in this Return what do you find? Your Bills—I am not speaking of the minor measures, but of what I will call the major measures—began to come into this House on 4th December, and between 4th December and 21st December, that is, in seventeen days, we passed, at your instance, five Bills of the greatest importance, and of the most controversial and complex character, and this in spite of the heavy calls upon our time and attention made by the Education Bill. How can the Prime Minister have the face to complain of the House of Lords, and to say that it is we who stand in the way of the legislative enterprise of His Majesty's Government? The fact is that the real complaint against us in respect to the session of last year is not that we rejected Bills that you meant us to pass, but that we passed a Bill which we were expected to reject.

The Prime Minister dearly loves a simile, and I see that in the speech which he delivered lately he compared this

House to a watch dog. He said the watch dog was only off the chain when the Liberals were in power. I rather like the idea of comparing this House to a watch dog, and I would suggest that the watch dog is generally on the alert when persons of a suspicious appearance and demeanour are seen hovering about the premises. But Lord Camperdown has proved by his speech and by this Return that the watch dog, last year at all events, was a most good-natured watch dog, and by no means inclined to be too pugnacious.

And yet I find the Prime Minister saying—and I think the Lord President said the same thing this evening—that it was impossible for His Majesty's Government to make an estimate of their legislation because the House of Lords' power of destruction defied calculation. He said it was like putting obstacles on the line and then abusing the engine-driver for putting on the brakes. Obstacles on the line! Where are the obstacles that we are putting on the line this session? Can the noble Lord point to a single one? If the line is strewed with wreckage, who are the wreckers? Not this House. We have not wrecked these measures, because they have never arrived at the stage of making their appearance as full-blown works of art for us to mar by our temerity. They remain in the stage of sketches—sketches of "a number of provisions which might constitute a Bill." Did we wreck the Irish University Bill or the Irish Council Bill, or that modest English Education Bill which has apparently been put on one side because His Majesty's Ministers find it easier to arrive at their object by acts of administrative persecution such as that which formed the subject of discussion here the other evening? I confess I am sorry that the Lord President supported the, I must say, most outrageous theory that it is the House of Lords which has stood in the way of a more abundant crop of legislation than that which there is any prospect of gathering this year.

There is one other reason which I desire to mention in favour of the view which I so strongly hold, and it is this —I think we have a right to appeal to the present Government for some improvement in the treatment of this House, because His Majesty's Ministers have admitted to the full the necessity of finding some means of adjusting differences of opinion when they arise between the two Houses. If differences are to be adjusted, pray let us not forget that time is essential for that purpose. The old saying, "Agree with thine adversary quickly," is only half a truth. You are not likely to agree with your adversary if your adversary tells you that you must accept his terms by half-past four o'clock the day after to-morrow.

I venture, therefore, to appeal to the noble Earl opposite—I should certainly appeal to the Leader of the House if he were here—upon the ground that they are both Second Chamber men, and, I believe, would do nothing that they could avoid doing which might show disrespect or contempt for the House of which they are such distinguished Members. I would remind them that at this moment proposals are before Parliament of the most violent and subversive character, proposals which, as we all know, give rise to great apprehensions even in the minds of their own supporters; and I say that that being the case, we have a right to claim the amplest opportunity for examining and considering those measures, and for laying before the people of this country arguments which, owing to the manner in which business is transacted in the other House, are too often withheld from the public knowledge.

This debate must, necessarily be an inconclusive debate, but the subject will not have been disposed of when it comes to an end. I would venture to say, as my last word, that, upon the action which His Majesty's Government will take in their treatment of this House must depend the action which this House will have to take, not in the defence of its own selfish interests, but in the defence of the interests of all those who desire that our legislation should be decently and deliberately conducted.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN): My Lords, I do not intend to address your Lordships for more than two minutes. The noble Marquess has almost tempted me to speak on a subject which, I think, is not really relevant this evening—the criticisms and the announcements made by the Prime Minister in regard to this House and its action. The time will, no doubt, come before very long when I shall have an opportunity of expressing my reasons for entirely agreeing with the Prime Minister, but I do not think it is to the point on this occasion.

The question is the state of business at the present time; and if I refer to the past experience of this House when the noble Marquess himself was its Leader, it is for the purpose, not of *tu quoque*, but of showing that the difficulties which confront the present Government also confronted the last Government, that they were treated in the same way, resulting in the same inconvenience, and were condemned by a similar complaint from the House at large. In 1905 a unanimous Resolution was passed condemning the practice which is now complained of, and it was assented to by the noble Marquess, who was then rather in a white robe on the subject; and at the end of that session my noble and learned friend Lord James of Hereford complained that no less than sixteen Bills had been sent down to the House of Commons, not one of which had obtained a Second Reading there. There must be a common cause for the misfortune which attends all Governments indiscriminately; and it is, if I may say so, not business, it is not quite fair to one Government to treat it as if it were entirely their fault, their blundering, and their numerous misdeeds that led to a result which was as marked and as severely condemned when the noble Marquess himself—who no doubt did his best, as well as we have done ours—with his friends, was in power.

There is some cause at the bottom, and anyone who has sat in the House of Commons as long as I have knows perfectly well that that cause is that the House of Commons is quite unable to discharge all the duties that are put on it. It is the simplest of all reasons, and no one has ever recognised it. When I first entered the House of Commons in 1880 there was no such thing as the closure, and I have no doubt many will recollect the great anxiety and distrust caused in the country among Liberals as well as Conservatives when an attempt was made to introduce the closure. The debate, on one rule alone lasted for eighteen days, so bitter and obdurate was the resistance. But that was only closure by two-thirds majority. That has been changed long ago, and it is not one Party who has changed it, but both Parties. The Grand Committees, which had no existence in 1880, have been encouraged by both Parties, and always because of the necessity of time, and for no other reason. The two-thirds majority became a simple majority, and then the Conservative Government introduced—I am not blaming them—what is now called "the gag"—namely, the appointing of a fixed number of days, after which the whole of the debate is to end, and this has produced results which have been referred to.

What is, if I may say so with respect, the use of shutting our eyes to the real thing that lies at the bottom? It is not resistance by this House that will improve the situation; it is not by being indignant that a sufficiency of time is not left that a remedy will be found. Let us find the remedy by reflection, but let us recognise that that which lies at the bottom of the whole thing is that the House of Commons is overloaded. The course to be pursued, if I may say so with all respect to the noble Marquess, is not to be indignant with the Government because they do what they cannot help, nor to rouse his followers and supporters in this House to resentment or to hasty and fiery action, but to recognise the facts as they are, and then to think whether it is possible for him and other wise and reflecting men to find some means by which that should be done, which I think Milton asked for—that there should be a possibility of a reasonable and prompt remedy for acknowledged grievances in Parliament. It is not so now, and it will not be so until we recognise the real root of the evil and apply ourselves in a statesmanlike spirit to endeavour to remedy it.

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 15th July, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

New Writ for the County of Stafford (North Western Division), in the room of Alfred Billson, esquire, deceased.—(*Mr. Whiteley.*)

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz. :—Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow.

Leeds Corporation Bill.—Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Devonport Corporation Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill (Prince of Wales' Consent signified). Bill read the third time, and passed.

Tees Valley Water (Consolidation) Bill [Lords] (King's Consent signified). —Bill read the third time, and passed with Amendments.

Ashton-under-Lyne, Stalybridge, and Dukinfield (District) Waterworks Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [Lords]. —As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Portishead District Water Bill [Lords]. —Read a second time, and committed.

Portobello and Musselburgh Tramways (Levenhall Extension) Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Considered; to be read the third time upon Wednesday.

Humber Conservancy Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP G).

Sir HENRY KIMBER reported from the Committee on Group G of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties concerned, the Committee had adjourned until Monday next, at half-past Two of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to :—London United Tramways Bill, without Amendment.

Amendments to :—King Edward's Hospital Fund for London Bill [Lords]; Heywood and Middleton Water Board Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act to enable Provisional Orders to be made for regulating Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries." [Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Tralee and Fenit and Wicklow." [Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under the General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Southwold." [Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [Lords.]

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 277.]

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 278.]

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ARMY.

Copy presented, of Report of the Conference appointed to examine the Shops and Machinery at Woolwich Arsenal (except Danger Buildings and Torpedo Factory) in order to consider whether any article not now made in the Ordnance Factories can appropriately be made there with this Machinery [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY.

Copy presented, of Statement of Principles to be kept in view in training the Territorial Force and the Special Contingent [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY (PAY, NON-EFFECTIVE PAY AND ALLOWANCES.)

Copy presented, of List of Exceptions to the Army Regulations as to Pay, Non-effective Pay, and Allowances sanctioned during the year 1906–7 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY (MILITIA).

Copy presented, of Further Regulations relating to the Militia [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY RESERVE.

Copy presented, of Further Regulations relating to the Army Reserve [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

EMPLOYMENT OF CHILDREN ACT, 1903 (BYE-LAWS).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address, 25th June; *Mr. Tennant*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 249.]

GOVERNMENT FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS COMMITTEE.

Copy presented, of Report of the Government Factories and Workshops Committee [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PACIFIC CABLE ACT, 1901.

Account presented, showing the Money issued from the Consolidated Fund under the provisions of The Pacific Cable Act, 1901, and of the Money received, expended, and borrowed, and Securities created under the said Act, to 31st March, 1907, together with a Copy of the Report of the Chairman of the Pacific Cable Board [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 250.]

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1887.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute dated 2nd July, 1907, granting to Hugo Meyer, later Counter Clerk and Telegraphist, Post Office, a retiring allowance under the Act [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL POST).

Copy presented, of the Foreign and Colonial Post Amendment (No. 17) Warrant, 1907, dated 24th June, 1907, [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL PARCEL POST).

Copy presented, of the Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 7) Warrant, 1907, dated 24th June, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TREATY SERIES (No. 18, 1907).

Copy presented, of General Index to Treaty Series, 1902–6 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No. 3857 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Position of Mr. Maull, Sub-Postmaster at Kingston-on-Thames.

MR. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston): To ask the Postmaster-General whether

Mr. S. Maull, stationer, of Clarence Street, Kingston-on-Thames, was authorised, in the year 1898, to open a sub-post office at that address, and has since carried on such office to the satisfaction of the postal authorities; whether, at the time of his appointment, Mr. Maull informed the authorities that he was acting as local secretary to the National Deposit Friendly Society, but no objection was then taken on that ground; whether he has recently been required to resign his position on the ground that he holds the same office of local secretary to the above society; whether a petition for his continuance as postmaster has been signed by a large number of tradesmen and residents, and forwarded to the Postmaster-General; and whether he will inquire into the circumstances and will consider whether it is possible to retain Mr. Maull in an office which he has held without objection for nine years.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) This matter has already been brought to my attention and was receiving my consideration. In all the circumstances of the case I have decided to allow Mr. Maull to withdraw his resignation on the understanding that he ceases to hold an agency for a life insurance company.

Sea Training of Boys in the Navy.

Mr. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what proportion the boys sent to the Nore Division of the Home Fleet for their sea-going training under the present system bear to those sent to the other divisions and to the fourth cruiser squadron of that fleet; and whether he will state what proportion the boys sent to the Nore Division bear to the normal numbers allowed by the complement of ships of that class.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) All youths on completing their shore training are sent to the battleships of the Nore division of the Home Fleet for sea-going training. On completing their training at Shotley and in the "Impregnable," all boys undergo their sea-going training in the fourth cruiser squadron; but, while waiting embarkation, those from Shotley (about 50 per cent. of the total number entered) go to the fifth cruiser squadron, and those from the "Impregnable" (about 30 per cent.) to the Devonport division of the Home Fleet. The advanced class (about 20 per cent.) remain in the "Impregnable" to await draft to the fourth cruiser squadron. The number of boys borne in the fifth cruiser squadron exceeds the normal boy complements by from five to eight per ship; and the number of youths in the battleships of the Nore division has been as much as twenty in excess of the normal boy complements.

Sale of the Singleton Estate, Drogheda.

Mr. NOLAN (Louth, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in the negotiations for the sale of the Singleton estate, Mell, Drogheda, it is proposed by the landlord to reserve a portion of the property; and whether, in this case, the landlord will be entitled to the bonus under the Act.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) In the proceedings for sale of this estate, which have been instituted before the Estates Commissioners, the owner proposes to exclude from the sale a portion of the property which appears to consist mainly of residential holdings. The proposed exclusion will be inquired into when the estate is being inspected. If the Commissioners should sanction the advances applied for a bonus would be payable.

Discussion of Scottish Estimates.

Mr. WATT (Glasgow, College): To ask the Prime Minister whether he will arrange to give another day for the discussion of the Scottish Estimates, so that the local affairs of Scotland may be considered.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) I am afraid it will not be possible to provide an opportunity.

The Channel Fleet.

Mr. NIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the relative strength of the Channel Fleet in 1906 as compared with the present time was in battleships seventeen to fourteen, and in armoured cruisers six to four; and whether the total force in all classes in

1906 was sixty-seven as against twenty-one in 1907.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The Answer to both Questions is in the affirmative. In the total of sixty-seven vessels belonging in 1906 to the Channel Fleet were included the "Sapphire," "Tyne," three scouts, and thirty-six destroyers, which, as I have already stated, were transferred with full crews to the Home Fleet, and are always available for exercise with the Channel Fleet, as was recently the case.

MR. NIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what length of notice would be necessary to enable the Channel Fleet to be fully manned and equipped for active service, and, if necessary, for action; and what would be the available strength in vessels of all types and in men upon an emergency summons, if issued at the present time.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The Channel Fleet is now fully manned and equipped for active service, and, if necessary, for action. The available strength is shown on page 269 of the current issue of the Navy List; but the first cruiser squadron, the "New Zealand," "Triumph," and "Juno," are absent from the flag. All have full crews except the "Juno," which recommissions to-morrow, July 16th.

MR. NIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what are the names, tonnage, and engine capacity of the scouts and torpedo craft attached to and permanently incorporated with the Channel Fleet; whether all such vessels are ready for active service; and whether they or any and which of them have at any time, and, if so, when, taken part in manœuvres as portion of the Channel Squadron or Fleet.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The torpedo craft with their attendant scouts which have full crews will be found on page 270 of the Navy List; these are ready for sea and are available for service with the Channel Fleet when required. Details of torpedo craft and scouts with four-fifth crews will be found on page 270a of the Navy List. Their tonnage and horse-power will be found in the body of the Navy List and also in the Return of Fleets. In April, four scouts, two torpedo gunboats, twelve destroyers, and one torpedo boat took part in exercises with the Channel Fleet; and in June and July, three scouts and forty destroyers were similarly employed.

Manœuvres of Channel, Mediterranean, and Atlantic Squadrons.

MR. NIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty on how many occasions and when the Channel, Mediterranean, and Atlantic Squadrons, or any two of them, have, during the last five years, manœuvred together, and whether under one commander; if so, under whose command were such manœuvres carried out.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The information desired is as follows:—

July, 1902.—Channel, Home and Cruiser Squadrons. Combined operations in the Channel. Under Vice-Admiral, Channel Squadron.

September, 1902.—Mediterranean, Channel and Cruiser Squadrons. Combined exercises in the Mediterranean. Under Commander-in-Chief, Mediterranean.

August, 1903.—Mediterranean, Home and Channel Fleets and Cruiser Squadrons. Manœuvres and tactical exercises in the Atlantic. Under Commander-in-Chief, Mediterranean.

May, 1904.—Mediterranean and Channel Fleets and Cruiser Squadron. Exercises in the Mediterranean. Under Commander-in-Chief, Mediterranean.

August, 1904.—Home and Channel Fleets and Cruiser Squadron. Combined tactical exercises in Home waters. Under Commander-in-Chief, Home Fleet.

August, 1905.—Mediterranean and Atlantic Fleets. Combined battle exercises at Lagos. Under Commander-in-Chief, Mediterranean.

February, 1906.—Channel, Atlantic, and Mediterranean, with attendant Cruiser Squadrons. Combined exercises at Lagos. Under Commander-in-Chief, Channel Fleet.

June and *July*, 1906.—Grand Manœuvres. Channel, Atlantic, and Mediterranean Fleets, with Cruiser Squadrons, were engaged in combined manœuvres, the Channel and Mediterranean Fleets being opposed to the Atlantic, each side under its own Commander-in-Chief.

February, 1907.—Channel, Atlantic, and Mediterranean Fleets, with attendant Cruiser Squadrons. Combined exercises at Lagos. Under Commander-in-Chief, Channel Fleet.

Shortage of Officers in London Yeomanry Regiments.

Mr. T. R. BETHELL (Essex, Maldon): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state what is the shortage of commissioned officers in the London Yeomanry regiments now going into camp for their annual training.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The shortage of commissioned officers in the regiments mentioned amounts to twenty-six.

Arming of Essex Royal Garrison Artillery (Volunteers).

Colonel LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): To ask the Secretary of State for War, how much, if any, of the Essex Royal Garrison Artillery (Volunteers) have been allotted to moveable armament; whether the guns of moveable armament have been removed from Grays; if it is proposed to transfer two 15-pounder breech-loading guns from Romford, leaving a company which usually parades seventy strong with only two guns; and, if so, how many 15-pounder breech-loading guns are available from other sources.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Eight companies and one heavy battery of the 1st Essex Royal Garrison Artillery Volunteers are allotted to moveable armaments. The distribution of the guns rests with the General Officer Commanding concerned. The numbers cannot be increased.

Connecting Post Offices by Telephones.

Mr. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will, as quickly as possible, connect up every post office in the Kingdom by telephone.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) A large number of post offices are connected with the telephone system, either as call offices or for the receipt and despatch of telegrams and express letters, and the number is being increased from day to day as opportunity offers. In many cases, however, there would be no advantage in connecting post offices with the telephone system proportionate to the very considerable expenditure involved in providing the necessary telephone lines. Ordinary telegraph circuits either cannot be used at all or only to a very limited extent for telephone purposes.

The Companies Bill.

Mr. RENDALL (Gloucestershire, Thornbury): To ask the President of the Board of Trade upon what date it is proposed to proceed with the Companies Bill.

(*Answered by Mr. Kearley.*) I cannot give the hon. Member any exact date, but my right hon. friend still hopes to proceed with the Companies Bill this session.

Board of Education—Functions of the New Medical Board.

Mr. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education if he can state the nature and work of the medical board which it is proposed to form in connection with his Department; what will be the number of doctors which will compose that board; how many of them will be women; and whether their duties will be of a purely advisory character.

(*Answered by Mr. Lough.*) When the duty of medical inspection of children in public elementary schools has been imposed by statute upon local education authorities, the Board of Education propose to establish a medical staff to assist them in advising local education authorities in regard to certain points arising under the Bill, to collect and correlate the information obtained through the medical inspection carried out by the authorities, and to issue periodical Reports based upon that information. In making appointments regard will, of course, be had to the possession of special knowledge of such branches of medicine as bear upon the medical treatment of children, hygiene, public health, including sanitation, and kindred subjects. It would be premature to enter into greater detail at the present time.

Revision of the Records of Orissa.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the statement made in the Bengal Administration Report for 1905–6 to the effect that it has been decided to have a general revision of the records of Orissa done by a paid staff under the control of the settlement officer; whether he is aware that the settlement of Orissa was effected ten years ago for the ensuing thirty years; whether this revision of records is ordered in contemplation of an earlier revision of the existing settlement; and, if not, whether he will explain why it is proposed to subject tenants, landlords, and Government ryots to vexatious inquiries until the time arrives for undertaking a new settlement of this part of India.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) For some years proposals have been under consideration for keeping up to date the record-of-rights prepared at great expense in the last resettlement of the temporary settled districts at Orissa. It has now been decided to provide for the continuous maintenance of the record by means of a permanent staff of revenue inspectors such as exists in other provinces. As a preliminary to this, it is proposed that the entries in the record-of-rights of each village shall be corrected where necessary and brought up to date by a settlement officer and a suitable staff. The land revenue will not be revised and the term for which the assessments have been sanctioned will not be disturbed. A correct record of proprietary and tenancy rights has been found in Bengal and elsewhere to be beneficial to owners and occupiers of land. It is not anticipated that the revisional operations will be vexatious to the people. Similar operations have been carried out in other districts without such consequences.

Belfast Labour Dispute and Poor Law Relief.

MR. J. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the increase in the number of provisional admissions into the Belfast workhouse in consequence of the labour dispute now existing in that city, and the extra expense involved to the ratepayers thereby; whether he is aware that a number of cases were refused admission on the sole ground that they were victims of the dispute; and whether the Local Government Board will issue any instructions to the guardians in this matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Local Government Board have ascertained from the clerk of the Belfast union that there has been some increase in the number of provisional admissions to the workhouse, and this increase has been attributed to the local labour dispute. The chairman of the admission committee has represented that in no case has admission been refused on the ground that the application was the result of the labour dispute, but all applications have been dealt with on their merits in the ordinary course. The Local Government Board do not propose to interfere with the responsibility and discretion of the guardians in the matter.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Contracts for Submarines.

MR. GEORGE FABER (York): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty how many submarines have been ordered since the present Government came into office; to what firm or firms have the orders been given; were competitive tenders invited in each or any case; and, if not, how many firms were invited to tender in each case; and was the sanction of the Treasury obtained before a departure from the usual practice was adopted.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): Seven submarines have been ordered from Messrs. Vickers, and two have been commenced at Chatham, since the present Government came into office. In accordance with the practice hitherto adopted by successive Boards of Admiralty in regard to this special class of vessel, and continued after due consideration by the present Board, no competitive tenders were obtained. Treasury sanction was not required.

MR. GEORGE FABER: But did not the Public Accounts Committee find that the sanction of the Treasury was necessary?

*MR EDMUND ROBERTSON: They made a recommendation to that effect, which will, of course, be carefully considered.

MR. GEORGE FABER: Is it not the case that the cost of each submarine is very greatly increased by this system of secret contracting with private firms?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON was understood to reply in the negative, and to point out that the Admiralty could make comparisons with the cost of similar works in the dockyard.

MR. GEORGE FABER asked the difference in the cost.

*MR. SPEAKER: Notice should be given of that Question.

Channel Fleet.

MR. GEORGE FABER: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the Channel Fleet now has its full complement of fourteen battleships assembled; and, if so, on what date the full number was reached.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The Answer is in the negative.

Mobilisation of Ships of War.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty on how many occasions has it been proved by experiment that the eleven battleships and ten cruisers now laid up with skeleton crews can be made immediately serviceable for active war within five days, with full crews and complete stores and ammunition.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The system has only come into force generally during the last two months, and the Admiralty are absolutely satisfied that the ships can be mobilised in the time given.

MR. HUNT: But will these ships be ready in five days?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Of course there has not been an actual experiment, but the Admiralty rely on the advice of the best naval experts.

Channel Fleet—Destroyers.

MR. HUNT: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what is the number of destroyers which Lord Charles Beresford will always have under his immediate command with the sea-going squadron of the Channel Fleet.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The Admiralty deprecate the introduction of the names of individual naval officers into Parliamentary Questions. According to present arrangements, which are still in process of development, there are forty-eight destroyers fully manned ready to be placed under the orders of the Commander-in-Chief of the Channel Fleet when necessary for exercises.

MR. HUNT: Are there at present any destroyers under the immediate command of the Admiral?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: None, Sir.

Channel and Home Fleets.

MR. HUNT: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the forty-three warships transferred from the sea-going squadron of the Channel Fleet to the Home Fleet are always as instantly ready to meet a sudden attack as if they had been left with the sea-going squadron under the immediate command of Lord Charles Beresford.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The reply is in the affirmative. The Admiralty deprecate any comparison between the respective merits of the Flag Officers commanding the different fleets.

MR. HUNT: Are these warships just as ready now as they would be under the immediate command of an Admiral, and why cannot they remain under his command?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON'S reply was understood to be that that was a question for the Admiralty to decide.

Nucleus Crews.

MR. HUNT: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what are the existing complements and crews of the eleven battleships and ten cruisers, respectively, now laid up with skeleton crews; and what additional number of men are required in each case to make the ships ready for immediate war, and where are these additional men now located.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The existing complements vary from one-eighth to one-tenth of full numbers. According to the established practice of the Navy, details of complements and arrangements for mobilisation are not published.

MR. LEVERTON HARRIS (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): The right hon. Gentleman has not answered the last part of the Question.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Yes. I said they were at the depots and training establishments.

West Indian Squadron.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can now say what decision the Government have come to regarding the re-stationing of ships in the West Indies; and, if so, how many cruisers will be kept in the West Indian waters.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The "Indefatigable," "Brilliant," and "Scylla," nineteen-knot cruisers, are to be permanently stationed on the North America and West Indian Station; and during portions of the year the Fourth Cruiser Squadron, consisting of three first-class armoured cruisers, will visit the West Indian Islands. The "Brilliant" is detached to Newfoundland during the fishery season.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: Will the three cruisers be more in the West Indian waters than on the Atlantic coast?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON asked for notice.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): Is it intended to ask the West Indies to make any contribution towards the cost?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I am not aware.

Malta Torpedo and Destroyer Flotilla.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what is the present strength of the torpedo and destroyer flotilla at Malta; and have steps been taken to make up the losses that have occurred in the Mediterranean recently.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Seven first-class torpedo boats and eleven destroyers. The reply to the second part of the Question is in the negative.

Distribution of Ships with Nucleus Crews.

MR. HUNT: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty where the eleven battleships and ten cruisers now manned with skeleton crews are laid up, and how long it is since these ships have cruised at sea for more than a week.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The ports to which the Special Service vessels are attached are shewn at page 270 of the current Navy List. As regards the last part of the Question, I must refer the hon. Member to my reply to his Question No. 4 on to-day's Paper.†

Queen's Barracks, Perth.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that owing to lack of accommodation at the sergeants' mess, Queen's Barracks, Perth, there is scarcely standing room when the mess is being used by Volunteer sergeant instructors, Militia permanent staff sergeants, and depot sergeants; and what steps have been taken to secure an immediate remedy.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): Sanction has been given for the provision of an additional room for the sergeants' mess and the work will be put in hand as quickly as possible.

---

† See Question "Mobilisation of Ships of War" on page 311.

St. Helena Defence.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state exactly the composition of the staff which is temporarily detained at St. Helena in order to look after the guns, roads, barracks and fortifications; whether this temporary arrangement, which has lasted since October last, is to continue much longer; and whether he can now state what garrison is to be left on the island to maintain the guns, fortifications, barracks, roads and telephones in a proper and efficient state of repair.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): At the same time may I ask the Secretary of State for War of how many persons does the staff now in charge of the guns, barracks and fortifications at St. Helena consist.

MR. HALDANE: The staff at present detained at St. Helena consists of one Royal engineer officer and one foreman of works. These will shortly be replaced by an agent who will take charge of all War Department property in the island and employ any necessary caretaker. No garrison will be maintained in the island during peace.

Territorial Army Colours.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is proposed to present colours to infantry battalions of the Territorial Army; and, if not, whether the twenty-three battalions of Militia, who are to be merged in the Territorial Force, will be permitted to retain theirs.

MR. HALDANE: This Question belongs to a class of inquiry to which it is impracticable at the present stage to return answers.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): When are we likely to get the information?

MR. HALDANE: I cannot say. We find it expedient first to decide broad principles.

Cavalry in Scotland.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can now state whether it is intended to quarter two cavalry regiments in Scotland; where they are to be quartered; when are the necessary barracks to be commenced; and how long it is estimated it will take to complete them.

MR. HALDANE: I have nothing further to add to the Answer which I gave on the 10th instant to a Question on this subject addressed to me by the hon. Member for South Edinburgh.†

*MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that a distinguished personage recently suggested in Scotland that when the Greys had departed, the only representative of cavalry in Scotland would be the Captain General of the Royal Archers, and did not the right hon. Gentleman think it desirable promptly to reinforce the noble Duke who occupied that position?

MR. HALDANE said he was not aware of the statement.

*MR. YOUNGER: Where are the Scots Greys now?

MR. HALDANE: At Tidworth.

Defective Small Arm Ammunition.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether an order has been issued to the effect that the whole of the supplies of the 1906 re-made cartridges, representing many million rounds and distributed throughout the country, were to be returned in consequence of their being proved defective and dangerous in use; and if these supplies have been replaced by sound and effective cartridges.

MR HALDANE: The reply is in the affirmative. Some millions of rounds have been withdrawn owing to the possibility of there being a few defective rounds amongst them. Any supplies withdrawn are replaced automatically.

Maryhill Barracks.

MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, what troops will be stationed at Maryhill Barracks when the cavalry regiment has left Scotland.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxvii., 1599.

MR. HALDANE: Under present arrangements these barracks will be occupied in the Autumn by a brigade of Field Artillery.

St. Helena.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that owing to the condition of the public funds at St. Helena there is now no money available for the repair of the roads which are, or may be, required for strategical purposes; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

MR. HALDANE: It does not appear probable that the roads in St. Helena will be required for strategic purposes.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Then are they to be allowed to fall into disrepair?

MR. HALDANE: That is a matter for the local authorities.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: They have no money.

Woolwich—Threatened Strike.

MR. LEVERTON HARRIS: On behalf of the hon. Member for the Brigg Division of Lincolnshire, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, whether he can supply any details as to the alleged threatened strike of employees at Woolwich.

MR. HALDANE: A deputation of men who complained of short work has been received by the chief superintendent who is now considering what can be done to meet the wishes of the men.

Military Bands and Political Gatherings.

MR. BRANCH (Middlesex, Enfield): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, if he is aware that the meeting at Southgate on the 22nd June last, at which the band of the Royal Artillery was present, was a meeting held under the auspices of the Primrose League to promote the candidature of Colonel Bowles, who made a speech, in the course of which he said the Army was on paper and the Navy dwindling; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

MR. HALDANE: As I informed the hon. Member when replying to his Question on the 8th, the military authorities were unaware that the fête at Southgate was a political meeting. When sanction for the attendance of the Royal Artillery Band was given, permission was in fact given on the distinct understanding that the meeting was not a political one. The organisers of the meeting have been asked to explain how the guarantee came to be given.

Royal Army Medical Corps in India.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL (Dublin University): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that officers of the Royal Army Medical Corps, under the substantive rank of colonel but holding the appointment of senior medical officer in a command in India, have been refused the additional daily allowance of 5s. to which such officers are by the terms of paragraph 4 of the Army Order of 10th January, 1907, expressly entitled if serving abroad, and that such refusal has been justified on the ground that service in India is not service abroad within the meaning of the Army Order; and, if so, seeing that such a construction is a direct violation of the letter as well as of the spirit of the Order in question, he proposes to take any, and, if any, what, action in the matter.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. HOBHOUSE, Bristol, E.): The Army Order referred to published a Royal Warrant modifying certain paragraphs of the Pay Warrant of the Army, the preamble of which specially exempts the Indian Empire from the sphere within which the Warrant is in force. Officers of the Royal Army Medical Corps serving in India receive special Indian rates of pay, as laid down in the Indian Army regulations, and it is not proposed to disturb this arrangement.

Victoria Memorial, Calcutta.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, if the proposal to erect a great hall in Calcutta with the funds subscribed for the Victoria Memorial has been abandoned; if so, how much has been expended on the plans and foundations; and what is it proposed to do with the balance of the fund?

MR. HOBHOUSE: The proposal to build a hall in Calcutta with the funds subscribed for the Victoria Memorial has not been abandoned. A committee of experts recently reported on the foundations which have been laid: their Report has been forwarded to the architect, Sir William Emerson, who will advise whether any modifications in his original plan are necessary.

Mr. Veal's Murderers.

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.) had on the paper the following Question: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the the Colonies what has happened to the seven natives who several weeks ago were sentenced to death for the murder of Mr. Veal during the recent disturbances in Natal; will he say whether some of them have been reprieved; and does the Secretary of State anticipate that after so long a lapse of time the extreme penalty of the law will be enforced upon the remaining convicts. When called upon to put the Question the hon. Member said: "It is too late, the men have been executed."

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): Perhaps I may be allowed to read the Answer. Of the seven men condemned to death the officer administering the Government of Natal has commuted the sentences of four. The death sentence has, I understand been carried out in the case of the other three.

St. Helena and South African Customs.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if the Government will make representations to the Cape Colony Government with a view to the reduction of the duties on agriculture produce, such as potatoes, on which the duty is £2 per ton, and on live stock imported in the Colony from St. Helena, in view of its present improverished condition.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Governor of St. Helena has recently been in direct communication with the Government of the Cape Colony on the subject. It is feared that the South African Customs Union Convention, to which the Cape Government is a party, does not permit of the grant of the reduction desired in the circumstances, but inquiry shall be made.

Labor in the Johannesburg Mines.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if the places of the Chinamen, who were recently repatriated from the Johannesburg mines, have been filled by the supply of other labour equally efficient.

MR. CHURCHILL: The responsibility in those matters rests entirely with the Transvaal Government and I have at present no information; should it be received I will consider whether I can deal further with the hon. Member's question.

British Consuls in British Colonies.

MR. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his decision to appoint consuls to act in British Colonies was in any way due to requests made or advice tendered by the Colonial Premiers or other Colonial authorities; whether the gentlemen who have been, or are about to be, appointed to these appointments were selected in consultation with Colonial authorities; whether it is anticipated that the services of these gentlemen will be of value to the Colonies; and, if so, whether the Colonies have offered to pay the whole or any part of the salaries of the gentlemen so selected.

I beg also to ask the President of the Board of Trade in how many cases within recent years has the Government of a Colony offered to defray or share the cost of maintaining a consulate in cases where that particular Colony had special interests; in how many cases has such offer been accepted; and what proportion in each case has the contribution paid by the Colony borne to the total expense of the consulate.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury) (for Sir EDWARD GREY): There are eight consular posts at which part of the expenditure is borne by Colonial Governments. At each of these the Colony pays the actual expenditure. In four cases the Imperial Government makes fixed contributions towards the total costs; in three an allowance is provided for such expenses as are involved by the performance of purely consular duties; in the remaining cases all expenses are borne by the Colony. It is not known what the total cost of any of these consulates may amount to. They are posts where only questions of local interest are likely to arise. Otherwise the Imperial Government would have to retain sole control, and consequently defray the whole cost of maintenance. One case has occurred where the offer to share the cost was on this account not accepted.

Chinese Railway Contracts.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is in a position to state the result of negotiations with the Government of China relative to their obligations to British subjects in respect of railway contracts.

MR. RUNCIMAN: Final contracts have been concluded in the case of two railway concessions, viz., those from Shanghai to Nanking and from Canton to the boundary of Hongkong, and the work of construction is proceeding on the former railway. As regards the remaining British railway concessions negotiations are still proceeding, and, though progress is slow, His Majesty's Government cannot anticipate that the Chinese Government will fail in the end to respect the obligations which they have incurred in regard to them.

Turkish Customs Duties.

MR. LYNCH (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what States have to signify their consent to the proposed increase in the Turkish customs duties before such increase can be levied; which of these States have already signified their consent either finally or subject to ratification by their Parliaments; and whether he can state when the increase is likely to come into force.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The assent of all the Powers has now been finally given to the increase in the Turkish customs duties, and my right hon. friend understands that the increase was to come into force on the 12th instant.

Turkish Finance—Macedonian Budget Deficit.

MR. LYNCH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the recent loan of £250,000, contracted by the Turkish Government for the purpose of supplying the deficit in the Macedonian budget, was secured on the guarantee of the surplus of those Turkish revenues which are administered by the European institution called the Ottoman Public Debt, and are on the increase every year; whether the said revenues, known as ceded revenues, and forming the best security which Turkey has to offer, are at present mortgaged in respect of charges for special temporary loans such as the above to the extent of £420,000, and, if not, to what extent they are so mortgaged; and whether it has been estimated by the British delegate on the Ottoman Public Debt that these special temporary charges will be wiped out in 1909, provided that the 3 per cent. increase in the Turkish Customs be applied to defray the deficit on the Macedonian budget, which has hitherto been made good by means of such loans.

MR. RUNCIMAN: His Majesty's Government understand that the recent loan of £250,000 contracted by the Ottoman Government was secured on the guarantee of the surplus of the ceded revenues administered by the Ottoman Public Debt. The second part of the Question concerns the Council of the Ottoman Debt, for which His Majesty's Government is not responsible and with whom the information rests. Estimates made by the British delegate are a matter for consideration by the bondholders by whom he is appointed, and my right hon. friend cannot make official statements concerning them, but according to his information the revenues referred to will not be available for other purposes till after 1910.

MR. LYNCH: I beg to ask the Secreof State for Foreign Affairs whether the supplementary financial guarantee given to the Powers by the Turkish Government in respect of the deficit on the Macedonian budget is secured on the surplus of the revenues administered by the Ottoman Public Debt and known as the ceded revenues; and, if not, whether this surplus will be available for the purpose of kilometric guarantees for railways in the year 1909, provided that the increase in the Turkish customs be put into force.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: The Answer to the first Question is in the negative. The guarantee is secured on the new or tithe revenues. According to the best information obtainable the surplus referred to in the hon. Member's Question is pledged till 1910, and will not therefore be available for other purposes till the following year.

Mr. LYNCH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the British delegate on the council of the Ottoman Public Debt who during the recent negotiations in connection with the three per cent. increase in the Turkish customs duties, withheld his consent to the proposal to provide an additional guarantee for the Macedonian budget out of funds other than the funds known as the ceded revenues, and not immediately under the control of the Debt, has now signified his consent to the proposal.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: His Majesty's Government are not responsible for the decisions of the Council of the Debt, and the British and other delegates are, my right hon friend presumes, bound by the decision of the majority.

Ottoman Public Debt Council.

Mr. LYNCH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether out of seven members composing the Council of the Ottoman Public Debt, three are also directors on the board of the Baghdad Railway, while a fourth represents a foreign financial institution having five representatives on this board; whether the principal administrator of the Ottoman Public Debt is also a director of the Baghdad Railway; and, if so, whether he will bring these facts to the attention of the foreign bondholders.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: Such information as is available on this subject is to be found in published documents within reach of the holders of Ottoman stock. My right hon. friend has no obligation to advise them on matters concerning their private business.

Mr. LYNCH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether in view of the sacrifices made by British trade in connection with the 3 per cent. increase in the Turkish customs duties he will represent to the Turkish Government the unfairness of applying the surplus of the revenues ceded to the Ottoman Public Debt, which could otherwise have been used as a security for temporary loans in respect of Macedonia, to purposes imposing fresh burdens upon the Turkish people in the shape of kilometric guarantees to foreigners in respect of railways.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: My right hon. friend has already stated that according to his information the revenues referred to will not be available for other purposes till after 1910. My right hon. friend would be delighted to give sound financial advice whenever he has any at his disposal in any quarter in which it was likely to be acceptable.

Turkish Railway Guarantees.

Mr. LYNCH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will ascertain the yearly amounts of the grants-in-aid made by the Turkish Government in the form of kilometric guarantees or otherwise to each of the existing railways in Turkey, including separately the existing branch of the proposed Baghdad Railway, for a period of five years up to and comprising the financial year 1906–7.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: The hon. Member will find the information he desires—except figures for 1906–7, which are not yet published in final form—in a series of publications issued annually by E. Souma and Company, of Constantinople, and entitled, *Statistique des Principaux Résultats de l'Exploitation des Chemins de Fer de l'Empire Ottoman.*

Germany and Turkish Finance.

*Mr. REES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether an agreement has been signed between the Deutsche Bank and the National Bank of Berlin for common financial action in Turkey; whether a German bank is to be established in Baghdad with the assistance of various German financial institutions; whether it is proposed to construct with German capital a railway from Baghdad to the Persian frontier; and, if so, whether he will press for permission to build railways with British capital in those portions of Asia Minor where the communications are at present in German hands.

MR. RUNCIMAN: My right hon. friend is not aware of the conclusion of any such agreement, nor has he information that a German bank is to be established in Baghdad, and these are not matters in which a foreign government could interfere. Provision is made for the construction of a railway from a point near Baghdad to Khanikin in the Baghdad Railway Convention of 1903. My right hon. friend would always be ready to support applications for railway concessions in Turkey, provided he were satisfied that they were put forward in good faith and commanded the requisite capital.

*MR. REES: Was there not an unexpressed understanding that while Asia Minor was the sphere of German railway influence, Mesopotamia should be retained in the sphere of British influence?

MR. RUNCIMAN was understood to reply that that was possibly so.

Death Duties.

MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what was the amount of the death duties assessed on the property of the late Lord Midleton, including the Peper Harrow estate; and whether these have yet been paid.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): It would not be in accordance with precedent or with propriety to give particulars of private property in regard to which the Government is in possession of information only for the single purpose of assessing duty therein.

Scotland—Education Equivalent Grant.

MR. COCHRANE: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer in view of the fact that a special grant of £100,000 is to be provided for the provision of new elementary schools in England and Wales, what amount he proposes to allocate to Scotland as an equivalent grant.

MR. ASQUITH: It would be premature to consider this suggestion until expenditure has taken place out of the grant in question and the amount of the actual expenditure has been ascertained; but I may say at once that the extension of the practice of equivalent grants to the case of services involving a comparatively small expenditure would give rise to serious administrative difficulties and lead to great waste of public money.

Import Duties.

MR. HUNT: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what was the amount of revenue raised during the last financial year from import duties on each of the following articles: sugar, tea, figs, plums and raisins, cocoa, coffee, currants, and chicory.

MR. ASQUITH: The net amount of the Customs revenue collected during the the financial year 1906–7 in respect of the articles enumerated in the Question was:—

	£.
Sugar - - -	6,250,834
Tea - - -	5,588,288
Figs - - -	64,652
Plums - - -	65,087
Raisins - - -	215,859
Cocoa, Cocoa Husks, Cocoa or Chocolate prepared, and Cocoa Butter -	246,990
Coffee - - -	175,216
Currants - -	121,721
Chicory - -	48,550

Land Values.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if the promise that existing contracts will be rigidly respected as sacred will safeguard the case of the purchase of land which, although of a present low rental value, has been bought at a high price as prospective building land from the effects of any change in the system of valuation or rating.

MR. ASQUITH: This is a hypothetical question, the answer to which may be deferred until legislative proposals dealing with the matter come before Parliament.

Epileptics and the Workmen's Compensation Act.

MR. GULLAND (Dumfries Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that throughout the country there are many workers subject to epileptic fits; that, under the Workmen's Compensation Act, the insurance companies will not undertake the risk of insuring them against accidents; that, contracting out not being allowed, they are in danger of losing their employment; and what steps, if any, he proposes to take to prevent this class from being deprived of the opportunity of earning a livelihood.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I have no official information on the matters referred to in the Question. I believe, however, it is the fact that, quite apart from the Workmen's Compensation Act, epileptics have difficulty in finding employment. The new Act may aggravate that difficulty though such cases could have been provided for under an Amendment which I moved on the Report stage of the Bill last autumn, and which, after being left to the judgment of the House, was rejected. The matter is one which obviously cannot be considered with reference merely to the effects of the Act, and as my hon. friend will be aware, the whole question of the treatment of the feeble-minded, including epileptics, is under the consideration of a Royal Commission whose Report may be expected shortly.

MR. GULLAND: Is it not the case that already a good many epileptics have lost their employment in consequence of the passing of this Act, and cannot the right hon. Gentleman deal with their case in some way?

MR. GLADSTONE: No such cases have been brought to my notice.

MR. GULLAND: I know of a good many.

SIR J. RANDLES (Cumberland, Cockermouth): Pending the Report of the Royal Commission cannot these discharges be suspended?

MR. GLADSTONE: I have no power, legal or otherwise, to do that.

SIR J. RANDLES: The hon. Gentleman might be able to use some influence.

Mr. A. A. Lynch's Pardon.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state the reason why a free pardon has been granted to A. A. Lynch.

MR. GLADSTONE: It would be contrary to practice for me to make a statement of the reasons for the advice which I gave to the King; but I think I may say that, in view of the altered condition of affairs in South Africa, I felt I might recommend to His Majesty a special exercise of the Royal clemency in this case.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): Will the pardon qualify for service in this House in the event of election?

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Yes, of course.

MR. GLADSTONE: I think that would be so.

Mr. Ronaldson—Scottish Mine Inspector.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to a letter sent by Mr. J. M. Ronaldson, one of His Majesty's mines inspectors for Scotland, in which Mr. Ronaldson interfered with the business of the Ayrshire Miners' Federal Union and expressed opinions regarding its action in trying to get firemen to join it; whether in doing so Mr. Ronaldson was exceeding his duties; and what steps the Secretary of State proposes to take to prevent the repetition of such interference.

MR. GLADSTONE: I have seen the letter referred to in the Question. The inspector informs me that he wrote the letter because he has found it difficult in practice to get the under-officials, and especially the firemen, to see that the men comply with the statutory regulations, and in his opinion the difficulty would be increased, and the maintenance of proper discipline in the mines prejudiced, if the firemen were compelled to join the men's union. In replying to the inspector's letter the secretary of the union says that the official of the union had no hand in any attempt to force the firemen at the mine in question into the union. In view of the fact that the paragraph in the inspector's letter to which the hon. Member refers was no more than the expression of an individual opinion, I do not think that any action on my part is called for.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD: But the expression, though that of an individual, was also that of an official of the Home Office.

MR. GLADSTONE: But he had no authority to deliver the opinion officially, and it was only intended as an individual opinion.

Hackney Carriages.

MR. STRAUS (Tower Hamlets, Mile End): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can say when he proposes to introduce the promised measure to amend the Hackney Carriage Act of 1869.

MR. GLADSTONE: I hope to do so in the course of the next few days.

Taximeters.

MR. STRAUS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can state the reason why motor cabs are allowed to use taximeters and horse-drawn cabs are not.

MR. GLADSTONE: The existing Public Carriage Order provides for the use of taximeters with horsed cabs, but no taximeter has yet been submitted for approval which can register a scale of fares complying with all the statutory provisions which now limit the action of the central authority in fixing cab fares. I am about to introduce legislation to remove these limitations.

Charitable Employments.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the thirty-seven workshops and laundries conducted by religious or charitable institutions, which are entered on the factory inspectors' registers for the metropolitan area, are carried on by way of trade within the meaning of the Factory Act; and whether there is any material difference between the employment, such as firewood cutting and laundry work, done in these places and that done in premises occupied by the Church Army.

MR. GLADSTONE: The places referred to in the hon. Member's Question are on the same footing as the Church Army workshops mentioned in my reply to his Question on the 8th of last April.† The fact that they are visited and registered does not make them factories or workshops, and there is no material difference, generally speaking, between the employment in these places and that in the premises occupied by the Church Army. The Factory and Workshops Bill which is now before the House provides for the inspection of industrial employment in charitable or reformatory institutions notwithstanding that the work is not carried on by way of trade or for purposes of gain.

Wage Particulars.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can give the number of firms convicted during 1906 for not complying with the Particulars Orders by neglecting to give proper particulars of wages to persons employed at their own homes.

MR. GLADSTONE: The hon. Member will find the information he desires on page 375 of the Annual Report of the Chief Inspector which has just been issued. Three cases were taken in respect of the failure to supply particulars to outworkers. Two resulted in convictions: one was dismissed on technical grounds.

Half-time Child Labour.

MR. BYLES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has any official reports as to the causes of the increase of half-time child labour reported by His Majesty's Inspector of Factories; and whether the Home Office proposes to take any, and, if any, what, action to check it.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxii., 17.

Mr. GLADSTONE: The increase reported by the chief inspector is an increase in certain towns only. As regards the cause, or one of the causes, of this increase, I may refer my hon. friend to a previous Answer of mine this session, on the 7th March, in reply to a Question from the hon. Member for West Bradford,† from which he will gather that the increase in child labour is more apparent than real. Half-time employment generally is decreasing.

Women Workers' Wage Deductions.

Mr. BYLES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what legislation he has in view which is designed to deal with the evils of factory employment such as are mentioned in the Annual Report of His Majesty's Inspectors just issued, and particularly with the injustice to which many low-waged women workers are subjected in the matter of fines, deductions, and other impositions.

Mr. GLADSTONE: The question of fines and deductions is under the consideration of a Departmental Committee, which expects to present its Report during the ensuing winter. I hope to be able to deal with that question at an early date. A Bill for the Amendment of the Factory Act in regard to the regulation of laundries and regulation of industrial work in charitable and reformatory institutions is now before the House. A number of Orders dealing with dangerous trades, home work and the provision of particulars of piece-work have been made within the last eighteen months. I have no statement to make at present as regards further legislation.

Factory Inspectors' Reports on Offenders.

Mr. CHIOZZA MONEY (Paddington, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department why it is considered necessary to suppress the names and addresses of the firms mentioned in the annual factory inspectors' reports as committing offences, in some cases of a gross character, against the Factory Act.

Mr. GLADSTONE: It is the practice of the Department, and I think it will be felt to be a proper one, that the published reports of the inspectors should not as a general rule reflect upon individual firms by name. Where an offence results in proceedings being taken in the Courts, publicity is given to it in that way; where proceedings are not taken the publication of names might be regarded as penalising employers who had not had an opportunity of presenting a defence to a judicial tribunal. I may add that until 1900 a detailed list of all prosecutions appeared annually in the Chief Inspector's Report; but as the prosecutions number nearly 4,000 a year, and the list occupied nearly 100 pages of print, and was of no special use, its publication was discontinued.

Girl Labour in Factories.

Mr. CHIOZZA MONEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been directed to the Report by Miss Squires, His Majesty's Inspector of Factories, that in one thread factory she found forty little girls all licking and moistening adhesive labels by the mouth, the number of labels so treated being about thirty gross per girl per day; that the tongues of most of the girls had the polished tip and brown coating characteristic of label lickers, and that the girls complained that the work made them feel sick at times; and whether, in the absence of legislation on such points, he will give the name of the firm referred to that public opinion may be exerted in the matter.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I think there would be objections to publishing the name of this particular firm. As regards the practice referred to, I may say that it formed the subject of inquiry some years ago by a Departmental Committee of which the hon. Member for Berwickshire was Chairman, and they did not see their way to proposing its prohibition. The inspectors have instructions to recommend the use of dampers and the abolition of the practice as far as possible.

Mr. CHIOZZA MONEY: Seeing that the inspectors have reported that nothing but legislation will stop the practice, will the right hon. Gentleman take steps to amend the law?

Mr. GLADSTONE said the matter had been carefully inquired into, and it had not been found possible to introduce legislation to stop the objectionable practice.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxx., 970.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR: Does the right hon. Gentleman say that the Home Office does not consider the practice injurious, but only objectionable?

MR. GLADSTONE: There is no proof that it is actually injurious to health.

MR. HUNT: Are little girls worked in this way in the factories of the great protective countries of Europe?

[No Answer was returned.]

Loans for Ferro-Concrete Works.

MR. WHITEHEAD (Essex, S.E.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board what period is usually allowed by his Board for the repayment of loans for work constructed by the method known as ferro-concrete.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): The period varies from fifteen to thirty years according to the position in which, and the purpose for which, the material is used.

Loans to Local Authorities.

MR. WHITEHEAD: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether any differences are made in the terms laid down for the repayment of loans according to differences in systems or materials of construction; and, if so, what are the terms and conditions for the various systems of construction.

MR. JOHN BURNS: The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. The terms usually allowed vary from ten years for such buildings as sheds and shelters to thirty years for stone or brick buildings.

Wages in Protective Countries.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has any statistics of recent date showing the wages paid to classes of workmen in countries where a protective tariff is in force compared with similar occupations in the United Kingdom; and whether he purposes presenting the same to the House.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. KEARLEY, Devonport): Information as to wages in foreign countries was published last year in the Third Abstract of Foreign Labour Statistics (Cd. 3,120), and comparisons are made so far as possible between wages in foreign countries and in the United Kingdom. Further inquiries are now being made in Germany and France, and the results will be published as soon as they are completed.

Cunard Steamers and Halifax.

MR. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the Cunard Steamship Company used to maintain a service of steamers that made Halifax its first port of destination on the other side of the Atlantic; and whether the Board of Trade has any information in its possession to show why this commercial company, after several years trial, abandoned Halifax and sent its steamers direct to New York.

MR. KEARLEY: I believe the facts are as stated in the first part of the Question. I presume that the company made the change because at the time they considered that the new arrangement would be more advantageous to them.

Steamship Insurance.

MR. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the rates of insurance charged upon Atlantic steamships destined for Halifax are roughly 50 per cent. higher than the rates charged on ships destined for New York; and whether it is proposed by His Majesty's Government to ask Parliament to subsidise a service of fast steamships upon a route which involves a 50 per cent. greater risk of loss of life and property.

MR. KEARLEY: The Board of Trade are informed by some of the chief associations of underwriters that in respect of vessels of equal class the rate for Halifax is practically the same as that to New York.

Companies Bill, Clause 23.

MR. CHEETHAM (Stalybridge): I beg to ask the President of the Board of

Trade whether he has recently received communications from representative commercial bodies with regard to Clause 23 of the Companies Bill, which requires private companies as well as public companies to file an annual balance sheet; and whether it would be possible to make any exception in favour of private companies.

Mr. KEARLEY: The Board of Trade have received many communications of the nature indicated by my hon. friend, and, after careful consideration, have decided to propose an Amendment when the Bill is in Committee, to exempt private companies from the provisions of Clause 23 of the Companies Bill.

School Hygiene.

Dr. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether His Majesty's Government will invite foreign Powers to send delegates to the International Congress on School Hygiene to be held in London next month.

The following Questions also appeared on the Paper:—

Mr. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he will consider the possibility of giving an official reception to the delegates of the Second International Congress on School Hygiene.

Mr. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD: To ask the President of the Board of Education whether the Board is taking any official part in the International Congress on School Hygiene; whether the Board has approached the Foreign Office with a view of securing the official representation of foreign countries at the Congress; whether any communication between the two offices on this subject has taken place; and what steps his Department has taken to carry out the promise made by its representative at Nuremberg, as printed in the transactions of the Congress, that the Government would officially recognise the Congress and feel honoured by its presence in London.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of EDUCATION (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.): The Board of Education are greatly interested in the approaching Congress on School Hygiene, and have intimated their intention of sending three of their officers to attend it. I hope to derive much information from its proceedings, and I have done my best to facilitate its deliberations by arranging for special investigations and reports to be prepared in elucidation of some important matters which will come under discussion. The various foreign countries have already received invitations, which were forwarded to the respective Governments through the Foreign Office. A considerable number have signified their intention to send representatives. The University of London are finding rooms for the Congress, and I am also placing certain rooms at South Kensington at their disposal. I have thus been able to carry out to the fullest extent all that was promised by the Board's representative at the Nuremberg Conference.

New General Post Office.

Mr. WHITEHEAD: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether, in the construction of the new General Post Office, it is proposed to adopt the system known as ferro-concrete; whether he is advised that a building so constructed will be as permanent as a building of bricks and mortar; and what is the expected duration of the ferro-concrete structure.

The FIRST COMMISSIONER of WORKS (Mr. Harcourt, Lancashire, Rossendale): The Answer to the first Question is—Yes. I am advised that the permanency and duration of such structures is likely to be at least as great as those of bricks and mortar.

Marking of Imported Cardboard Boxes.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that large consignments of empty cardboard boxes, bearing English wording and not marked in accordance with the Merchandise Marks Act, 1887, are being regularly imported into this country; and whether he will take the necessary steps to ensure that the Customs authorities shall be instructed to enforce the provisions of the Merchandise Marks Act in respect of such goods.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: The Board of Customs are not aware that there have been any importations of empty cardboard boxes marked with English words in such a manner as to contravene the Merchandise Marks Act, 1887. I beg, however, to refer the hon. Member to the Answer given on the 8th instant † by my hon. friend the Secretary of the Board of Trade on the somewhat analogous subject of the importation of match boxes. I have no doubt that the cases of these carboard boxes will not be overlooked in the consideration of the question promised by him.

Discharges of Boy Clerks.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in view of the fact that numbers of boy clerks are being discharged daily from His Majesty's Civil Service, he will expedite the consideration of the memorial as to the position of boy clerks presented in September last.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I hope that a decision on this question will be reached very shortly, but the subject is one that presents many difficulties and which requires very careful consideration.

Passive Resisters and Scottish Church Assessments.

MR. MENZIES (Lanarkshire, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether, in view of the fact that passive resistance has been resorted to in Stonehouse, Lanarkshire, against payment of assessments levied by the Church of Scotland upon tenants' improvements there, in order to build a new manse, he is aware that this new manse has been built and assessments have been arranged to be levied upon improvements of helpless tenants over a series of years, in spite of the petty attendance at the church itself and its generally unsound economic state; whether the Government intend next session to bring in a Bill to abolish this power of assessment and that especially over tenants' improvements; and, if not, whether a short Bill will be passed interdicting the Church of Scotland from further building of new manses or churches except with their own money, further increasing their ministers' salaries unless their congregations pay such increase, and in general interdicting the power of the Church to assess ratepayers for their own purposes.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): I have no official information with regard to the facts stated by my hon. friend, and I am well aware of the friction and feeling which any such proceedings are apt to arouse. But I regret that in regard to the two suggestions which he makes I am unable to give any undertaking now as to legislation. As he is aware, the terms of the Resolution moved by the Member for East Edinburgh ‡ on this subject in February last indicate the direction in which legislation is desirable and were assented to by the Government.

Rector of Fordyce Academy.

MR. MCCRAE (Edinburgh, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he is aware that the Rector of Fordyce Academy, a distinguished secondary teacher, who has been appointed head master of Keith public school, has been dismissed by the school board of Fordyce, on the ground of his claiming a fortnight's salary more than the school board considered him entitled to; and whether he intends to take any action in the matter.

MR. SINCLAIR: The School Board of Fordyce have, as stated in the Question, dismissed from their employment the Rector of Fordyce Academy, but I am unable to say what were the grounds for their action. It would be regrettable should the school board have taken this step in the present case for such a trivial reason as that suggested in the Question. The Department has, however, no power to interfere in the matter.

Fife Coast Fisheries.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he has received any reports of illegal trawling in the neighbourhood of May Island during the last three weeks; and whether he will take the necessary steps to safeguard the interests of the fishermen on the Fife coast.

MR. SINCLAIR: The Fishery Board for Scotland have received no complaints of illegal trawling in the neighbourhood of the Island of May for over four months. The interests of the Fife fishermen appear to be adequately safeguarded by the existing arrangements for fishery protection, but any necessary further steps will be taken.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxvii., 1161–2.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, clxix., 1533.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Will the right hon. Gentleman make further inquiries. I have private information.

MR. SINCLAIR: Certainly.

Ireland and the Butter and Margarine Bill.

MR. P. A. McHUGH (Sligo, N.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) whether he is aware that, in connection with the Butter and Margarine Bill now before this House, anxiety exists amongst Irish farmers who make salt firkin butter for home consumption and for export to Great Britain; can he say what are the intentions of the Government with reference to the fixing of a standard of moisture for Irish salt firkin butter, and is he aware that any reduction of the standard hitherto recognised would be ruinous to small farmers in many districts in the west of Ireland; and has the Department statistics showing the quantity of salt firkin butter exported from Ireland in recent years.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR IRELAND (Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.): The Butter and Margarine Bill now before the House makes no alteration in the amount of moisture permissible in salt firkin butter. In the statistics of butter exports from Ireland furnished to the Department the quantities of "fresh and salt" butter exported are not separately stated.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Has the hon. Gentleman satisfied himself that this Bill will not prejudicially affect in any way the Irish salt firkin butter trade?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: The Bill now before the House makes no alteration in the present law.

Clare Potato Crop.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) if he has received any notice as to the injury likely to be caused to the potato crop in county Clare owing to the inclement season; and whether arrangements can be made to enable the Clare farmers generally to spray their crops.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: The Department are aware of the present condition of the potato crop in county Clare and in other parts of Ireland owing to the inclement season, which I hope may now be taken as at an end. There is an agricultural instructor in county Clare appointed by the County Committee of Agriculture, and one of his duties is to give demonstrations and instruction regarding spraying to farmers. He is at present wholly engaged on this work. In addition the Department have located an agricultural overseer temporarily in the county for the spraying season, and have extended to county Clare their operations in connection with the distribution of spraying machines and materials, particulars of which were given in my reply of the 19th ultimo to a Question from the hon. Member for North Cork.† Moreover, a circular has been issued to every County Committee of Agriculture in Ireland authorising them, in the very exceptional circumstances of the present season, to purchase and hire out at a small daily charge, I think it is 6d. per day, knapsack sprayers to small farmers and others in the poorer districts who are not in a position to purchase such machines for their own use.

Irish Milk Industry.

MR. HALPIN (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) whether there are any special arrangements made so that milk may be carried safely and expeditiously from milk-producing districts in Ireland to the cities and large towns in England, in view of the fact that the Government allows butter and beef to be imported free from lands that pay no rent; and will it give every facility to Irish farmers, who have a heavier burden than they can bear in the present rents for land, to send their milk to England.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: The Department learn that milk is at present sent in small quantities from some dairying districts in Munster and Ulster to London, Manchester, and a few other centres in Great Britain. The traffic is conveyed by passenger train or other similar quick service at special rates and under regulations prescribed by the railways for the purpose of ensuring safety in transit and delivery. The Department have not received any complaint as to the inadequate facilities or unreasonable rates for this description of traffic.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxvi., 485-6.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): Has the attention of the hon. Gentleman been directed to the complaints of delay by railway companies in distribution of Irish produce?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: If any complaints come before me they shall be investigated.

MR. JOYCE: I have brought scores before the Board of Trade.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: That is not my Department.

MR. JOYCE: Then I will devote some attention to the hon. Gentleman's Department.

Tottenham Estate, Leitrim.

MR. P. A. MCHUGH (Sligo, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, with reference to the Tottenham, county Leitrim, estate, how many years has this estate been under the control of the Land Judge; is he aware that several years ago the tenants agreed to purchase at the prices suggested by the inspector sent down by the Estates Commissioners; is he aware that for years past the only obstacle to the completion of the purchase has been the refusal of Colonel Adamson, who purchased the mansion house, demesne, and mountains on the estate, to give an adequate supply of turbary to the Estates Commissioners for the use of purchasing tenants; and can he say when the sale will be completed.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The Registrar of the Land Judge's Court informs me that the petition for sale in the case of the Tottenham estate was presented in the year 1884. Considerable difficulty has been experienced in allotting plots of turbary for the use of the tenants, but in the opinion of the Land Judge the action of Colonel Adamson has not been unreasonable, as suggested in the Question. The Land Judge considers it only natural that Colonel Adamson, as purchaser of the mansion house, demesne, and mountain land, should desire to have the turbary allotments made in such a way as to avoid friction with the purchasing tenants and at the same time to preserve the amenities of his own property. A turbary scheme has now been finally approved, and the necessary amendments are being made in the maps and rentals. As soon as these details have been completed the documents will be put before the Estates Commissioners, who will then make an offer for purchase.

Derrahiney Estate, Galway.

MR. JOHN ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether Mr. Young has offered to sell his estate at Derrahiney, county Galway, to the Estates Commissioners; if so, does the offer include the entire estate; and, if not, what portion is reserved?

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have approached Mr. Young with a view to the purchase of his untenanted land in county Galway, and have been informed by Mr. Young that he farms the land himself and does not wish to sell it.

United Irish League and Grazing Farms.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state, in continuation of information given a few years ago on the same subject, the number of grazing farms and evicted farms held, respectively, by presidents and vice-presidents, secretaries, treasurers, and members of committees of the United Irish League.

MR. BIRRELL: The Government have no information upon the subject of the Question, and do not propose to make inquiries in the matter.

Agrarian Outrages.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the number of outrages recorded as agrarian in which firearms have been used during the three months ended 31st March, 30th June, 30th September, and 31st December of 1906, and the past two quarters of the present year.

MR. BIRRELL: The figures for the six quarters referred to in the Question, commencing with that ending on 31st March, 1906, were as follows:—7, 4, 6, 5, 13, and 22.

Derelict Evicted Farms.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state, in continuation of information given on the same subject in previous years, the total number of evicted farms in Ireland unlet on the 1st July in each of the years 1893 to 1907, both inclusive, under the heads of the number used or cultivated by landlords, the number worked by land corporation or similar body, and the number lying derelict respectively.

MR. BIRRELL: The Question appears to refer to Returns which have been presented to Parliament from time to time showing how evicted farms were then occupied on seventeen estates commonly known as Plan of Campaign Estates. The last such Return was presented, pursuant to an order of this House, in 1903 (Parliamentary Return No. 173 of that session). If the hon. Member should think fit to move for a continuation of that Return I will offer no objection.

Evicted Tenants and Voluntary Surrenders.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners or the police are in possession of information showing that, in a considerable number of cases in which application has been made by ex-tenants or their representatives for reinstatement, the holdings of such applicants are at present occupied by new tenants or purchasers by arrangement come to between the latter and the former tenants; that in many of these cases the arrangement thus mutually arrived at partook of the nature of a money payment from the new to the former tenant; and how it is proposed to deal with such cases under the provisions of the Bill now before the House.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that some cases of the nature referred to in the Question have come under their notice. The fact that an evicted tenant or his representative has received compensation from the present occupier of the holding is taken into consideration by the Commissioners when dealing with an application for reinstatement. I would refer the hon. Member to the 20th paragraph of the Estates Commissioners' Special Report on evicted tenants, from which it will be seen that the Commissioners have rejected applications on the ground, amongst others, that the applicants have voluntarily surrendered their holdings or sold their interest in them.

Ballydowd Evicted Tenants.

MR. MEAGHER (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will say what steps, if any, have been taken by the Estates Commissioners in the case of the representatives of Pierce Grace, who was evicted from his holding at Ballydowd, O'Mara's estate, county Kilkenny; if he is aware that the holding is in the occupation of a planter named Holmes, and that the landlord, in anticipation of the effects of the Evicted Tenants Bill now before Parliament, has advertised to be sold by auction on Thursday next his interest, and the interest of the evicted tenant; and will he see that no injustice is done to the representatives of the evicted tenant by reason of the said sale.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have received no application for reinstatement in this case, and have no information as to the matters of fact alleged in the Question.

Clifden Pier, Galway.

MR. O'MALLEY (Galway, Connemara): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland when the pier at Clifden, county Galway, promised under the provisions of the Marine Works Act, is to be constructed; and if he will state the cause of the delay in the fulfilment of the late Government's promise to have this work carried out.

MR. BIRRELL: The Irish Government are waiting the opinion of the Galway County Council upon the prelimininary plan which has been prepared by the Board of Works and sent to the council. I would remind the hon. Member of my Answer to his previous Question on 2nd May, namely, that the promise of the Government to endeavour to find a certain sum for marine works at Clifden was conditional upon the county council's undertaking to provide ancillary works. Unless a considerable contribution is made to the cost of the work, the expense will be beyond the funds still available under the Marine Works Act.

West of Ireland Crops.

MR. O'MALLEY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if steps are being taken to make provision against the destitution that is certain to result from the destruction of the potato and other crops in the West of Ireland this year, because of the excessive rainfall and abnormally cold weather during the last few months; whether he is aware that in Connemara considerable distress exists at the present time consequent on the failure of the potato crop last year; and whether, in view of these seasons of distress and of famine in Connemara and other districts on the western seaboard, he will give his serious consideration to this question.

MR. BIRRELL: The prolonged wet and cold weather in the West of Ireland has given some cause for anxiety in regard to the safety of the crops. The weather of last week was, however, most favourable, and, though small patches of blight have appeared in a few places, the general appearance of the potato crop is very good, and the other crops promise equally well. There is as yet no abnormal distress in Connemara. The people are busily engaged in cutting their turf, and, given a continuance of the fine weather, it is not too late for them to secure their winter supply. The result of the harvest generally will depend mainly upon the weather of the next few weeks. The state of the crops and of the people who are dependent on them will continue to receive the most careful attention of the Government. The Department of Agriculture have been taking all possible measures to secure the spraying of potatoes, both by giving instruction and by the sale, at and under cost, of spraying machines and material. I would refer to the full statement on this subject made by my hon. friend the Vice-President of the Department on 19th June.[†]

Belfast Health Commission.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware of the fact that the Belfast Health Commission, consisting of Colonel Harding, an ex-Lord Mayor of Leeds, Dr. Mair, a medical inspector of the Local Government Board of England, Dr. Chalmers, of Glasgow, and two inspectors of the Irish Local Government Board, appointed on the 11th February, 1907, to inquire into the cause of the high death rate in Belfast, has held twenty-four sittings, all the evidence at which has been taken on oath; and if he will state what statutory authority any person or persons other than inspectors of the Local Government Board have to hold inquiries under Section 209 of the Public Health (Ireland) Act, 1878, or to take evidence on oath.

MR. BIRRELL: The number of sittings held so far by the Commission referred to is correctly stated in the Question. All the evidence has been taken on oath. There is nothing to prevent other persons from being associated with inspectors of the Local Government Board in holding inquiries under Section 209 of the Public Health (Ireland) Act, 1878. The power of administering an oath is, however, vested only in inspectors, and this power has not been exercised by any of the other gentlemen on the Commission.

HONOURS AND PARTY FUNDS—A QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) rose to call attention to the letter appearing in *The Times* of Friday last, under the heading "Honours and Party Funds" and purporting to be written by the hon. Member for East St. Pancras (Mr. Lea).

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.). As this question was adjourned from last Friday because of the absence of the hon. Member for East St. Pancras, and as we are all anxious to get to the debate on preference, may I ask if it cannot be arranged to put the matter off again till to-morrow?

[†] See (4) *Debates*, clxxvi., 485–6.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member has no right thus to interefere.

Lord R. CECIL then asked, in accordance with the usual formal course, that the letter be read at the Table.

The Clerk at the Table read the letter as follows—

> "Sir,—I put a Question to the Prime Minister to-day at Question time in the House of Commons, with reference to a knighthood conferred on a director of a company which had been admitted from the Treasury Bench to have been guilty of a gross fraud on the Admiralty—one endangering a first-class battleship with all its crew.
>
> "I found that the rules and regulations of the House debarred me from criticising such acts of the Sovereign, even when those acts are committed on the recommendation of, or at the instigation of, either the Prime Minister on members of the Cabinet.
>
> "I think therefore it is only right that the matter should be ventilated through the columns of the Press.
>
> "If ever there has been a Government since 1832 which was pledged up to the hilt to strive for ideals held in respect by the democracy of this country, it is the present Government with its vast majority of Liberals and Radicals
>
> "A fortnight ago we spent three days in the House of Commons discussing a pious Resolution affecting the veto of the House of Lords. In the course of that debate Liberals and Radicals got up and vied with each other in denunciation of the principle of hereditary legislation.
>
> "At the time of this debate I put a couple of Questions to the clerks at the Table. These Questions were refused. I asked in those questions that the Prime Minister should give the House an assurance that no addition should be made to the peerage whilst this Government was in power, and, further, that the Prime Minister would in no case recommend to the Sovereign any persons for baronetcies or other forms of so-called honour. I think this line of conduct would have been consistent on our part; but, sir, there is another and graver aspect to the matter. These honours are bought and sold, the proceeds going principally to the war chest of the Party in office at the time these so-called honours are conferred. The Party funds are presided over by the Chief Whip. At times of election, if candidates come forward and cannot pay their expenses *in toto*, grants-in-aid are given; and, should the candidate become a Member, his vote and support of the Government are looked upon as secure, no matter what the issue or what pledges he may have given his constituents. Should he rebel and vote according to his conscience, to his pledges, or to what he is persuaded his constituents would wish him to do, then he is reproached by the Party Whips for not having held to what they look upon as a bargain. A fund is, perhaps, necessary, and, were the fund public, no harm would be done. Those who had subscribed would be known, and their intentions could be judged.
>
> "Sir, in inditing this protest, I sincerely and humbly hope that it may be the means of abolishing one of the hypocrisies of public life. Yours faithfully,
>
> "Hugh Cecil Lea.
>
> "House of Commons,
> "*July* 11*th*."

Lord R. CECIL: The portion of the letter which I venture to submit is clearly a breach of privilege is that which runs as follows—

> "The Party funds are presided over by the Chief Whip. At times of election, if candidates come forward and cannot pay their expenses *in toto*, grants-in-aid are given; and, should the candidate become a Member, his vote and support of the Government are looked upon as secure, no matter what the issue or what pledges he may have given his constituents. Should he rebel and vote according to his conscience, to his pledges, or to what he is persuaded his constituents would wish him to do, then he is reproached by the Party Whips for not having held to what they look upon as a bargain. A fund is, perhaps, necessary, and were the fund public, no harm would be done."

I think the House will agree that that is a serious charge. It amounts to this, that the hon. Member with all responsibility which attaches to any utterance in this House, charges the Government of the day with amassing a fund by very discreditable means, and then using that fund for the attempted corruption of certain hon. Members. That that is not too strong a summary of how the letter will be understood universally is shown by a letter which appeared in the *Daily News* to-day, over the signature of a well-known Liberal writer, Mr. Chesterton, who says—

> "So long as that mass of money remains unaudited, that mass of money is omnipotent. Rich men pay into it and are made Peers; poor men are paid out of it and are made slaves. But the thing is not written down anywhere, so that we can neither prove the bribery nor abolish the slavery."

Now, Sir, that seems to be almost as serious a charge as it is possible to bring against the Chief Whip, against the hon. Member who happens to be the Chief

Whip of the Ministerial Party, and also a very serious charge—and this, to my mind, is the public importance of it—against the independence and integrity of the House of Commons. We heard a little time ago that it was desirable that the will of the people as expressed by this House should prevail. There will be found not a few people who will say that if this charge is uncontradicted and uninvestigated that it is natural the Government should desire that form of the will of the people to prevail since they had already paid for it. I venture to submit that if the charge made by the hon. Member is untrue, it is a great outrage on the decency of public life, as well as a great breach of the privileges of this House. If, on the other hand, the charge be true—if it be really the case that there is an organised attempt to sell honours in order to corrupt Members of Parliament—then it is one of the most vital and important matters with which this House can possibly deal. That it is a breach of privilege I submit to the House is undoubted. On a less serious question in 1893 Mr. Gladstone said—

> "If I am asked whether a charge of corruption against the body of Members of this House constitutes a breach of privilege, I am afraid it is not possible for me to give any answer but one, and that in the affirmative."

I propose simply to move, "That the letter of the hon. Member for East St. Pancras, published in *The Times* newspaper on Friday last, is a breach of the privileges of this House, and that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the allegations made in that letter of the hon. Member and to report their opinion thereupon to this House."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the letter of the hon. Member for East St. Pancras, published in *The Times* newspaper of Friday last, is a breach of the privileges of this House, and that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the allegations made in the letter by the hon. Member, and to report their opinion thereupon to the House."—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): Sir, it is a matter of sincere grief to me that I should be accused of a breach of the privileges of this House, for I regard this House with the greatest respect and veneration, as the most indispensable and essential of all the institutions of the country. The statements I have made were made, on the contrary, with the sole desire to maintain the purity of both Houses of Parliament, and especially to maintain the reputation of this House with the country. The charge that honours are bought and sold is no doubt a serious one, but the House knows well, every candid Member knows from his own private conversations and public reading, that the charge is not made now or by me for the first time. So long ago as the 16th December, 1905, the *Saturday Review*, although a supporter of the then existing Government, made similar charges, accompanied by names, in an article entitled "The Adulteration of the Peerage." Since then the charge has been repeated in published correspondence and in letters to the Press, whereof one signed "M.P." presumably a Member of this House, appeared in the *Morning Post* last Saturday, while another appears in the *Daily News* of this day. And during nearly two years such charges have been matter of common conversation. This is a matter which involves the honour of this House. I humbly conceive that when such charges as these have been made, have been so often repeated, are still so generally current, and have now been made the object of a Motion in this House, and of other Motions still on the Paper, it behoves those involved to claim and to secure that they shall receive due investigation by some competent and independent tribunal, possibly a Committee of this House—a secret Committee if that be preferred—with power to send for persons, papers, and records. I believe that such a Committee would be indisputably convinced that the most serious grounds and the most pregnant facts exist, giving colour to the allegations made, but I beg the House to believe that, should it happily prove to be otherwise, no Member of the House will more rejoice than I at its being established that now, as of old time, the high honours of this realm are reserved for personal merit and public service, and are not the object of sale and barter. In 1715 this House impeached at the bar of the House of Lords that famous Tory Premier, the Earl of Oxford, and the 16th Article of the Impeachment was founded upon his recommendation to Queen Anne in 1711 of twelve Peers with the object, as was alleged, of turning the then Whig majority of the Lords in a Tory majority for the greater convenience of the Ministry. By which, says the 16th Article of the Impeachment—

> "The said Earl did most highly abuse the influence he then had with Her Majesty, and prevailed on her to exercise, in the most unprecedented and dangerous manner, that valuable and undoubted prerogative which the wisdom of the laws and the constitution of this Kingdom hath entrusted with the Crown for the rewarding signal virtue and distinguished merit; by which desperate advice he did not only as far as in him lay deprive Her Majesty of the continuance of those seasonable and wholesome counsels in that critical juncture, but wickedly perverted the true and only end of that great and useful prerogative, to the dishonour of the Crown and irreparable mischief to the constitution of Parliament." (Mahon's History of England, Vol., I. page 128.)

Sir, I submit to the wisdom of this House that things have reached a point when full investigation is imperatively demanded, and when an independent judgment of an impartial tribunal alone can set at rest allegations which affect the very foundation of the Constitution. Sir, I have repeated charges which the House well knows have long been current—that such desperate advice has of late years again been given, and that the true end of the prerogative has of late years again been wickedly perverted. For myself, Sir, I humbly submit myself to the judgment of this House, begging only that it will believe that what I have done has been done out of the sincere and honest concern I feel for its interests, its credit, its honour.

*Mr. SPEAKER: It is the custom for an hon. Member to withdraw when his conduct is under consideration by the House.

Mr. LEA having withdrawn,

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) rose to address the House.

Mr. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me manifestly unjust that the hon. Member should be called upon to withdraw.

*Mr. SPEAKER: I have called on the Prime Minister.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I understand that the practical effect of what has occurred is this. The noble Lord opposite, having brought forward a matter which he considers involves a breach of the privileges of this House, and you, Sir, not having expressed any opinion of your own in the matter, which would, I am sure, be conclusive with the House, it is left to the House to judge for itself whether the matter does involve a breach of privilege or not; and it falls to me as part of my duty to tender such advice as I can to the House on the merits of the case. The observations of Sir Erskine May which have been quoted do not appear to me to deal with the specific question to which the noble Lord directs the attention of the House. The noble Lord said that he founded himself upon the latter part of the letter dealing with the alleged moral effect of the practice which he attributes to us upon the action of Members of the House, and he imputes to a large number of his colleagues in this House a willingness to surrender their conscientious opinions, their pledges, and the known desires of their constituents in consequence of their——

Lord R. CECIL: The right hon. Gentleman does not mean that I said that?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No, the writer of the letter brings the statement forward that colleagues of his are willing to surrender the promptings of their conscience, and the pledges they have given, and the wishes of their constituents, because they have received pecuniary assistance from the Whips of the Party to which they professedly belong. That is a different question altogether from the mode in which and the motives with which honours are bestowed by the Crown. That is not directly a question of breach of privilege that I can see, and, therefore, I think I should do well to confine my observations to the specific charge, the more or less hypothetical charge, the vague charge, still the very serious charge, which the hon. Member has brought against his colleagues in the House. Let me add that if it is a charge against the Government, it is equally a charge against those who were responsible for the government of the country in previous years, and it is equally a charge against the groups, the Parties of Members sitting below the gangway opposite, who are all equally in the habit—I do not say equally, because I do not know anything about it, but we believe are in the habit of subsidising their Members and, therefore, may be assumed to have the same sort of ignoble and unworthy claim upon their Members, as is attributed on this occasion. What we have to consider to-day is whether the charge so made constitutes a breach of privilege. In dealing with that question by itself I would remark that steadily, and I think in increasing degree, the House has shown itself very unwilling to plunge into these cases of privilege. We have not had many of late years. They seldom, when they are accepted and acted upon, redound to the dignity of the House. The powers of the House to enforce the opinion it entertains of them by some treatment given to those who have committed the breach of privilege are very small, and altogether, as I say, there has been a growing feeling that it should only be in an extreme case that the House should take notice of a charge of this kind. I entirely share that view myselt. I believe that in this case, although such accusations or imputations as are brought in this letter against Members of the House are improper and unseemly, and I think unworthy, yet the House, by taking this serious notice of them, as suggested by the noble Lord, would not add to its own dignity, and they are better left to the judgment of the country as they stand. I shall end by moving—as was done on a previous occasion by the right hon. Gentleman opposite—as an Amendment to the noble Lord's Motion, "That the House do now proceed to the business of the day." But perhaps it is only right that I should say something, which can only be of a general kind, with regard to the particular allegation made. I am certain from what I have heard that my right hon. friend the Home Secretary, who conducted the affairs of the Liberal Party when we were in Opposition—I mean conducted their affairs in the sense of organisation and discipline among the Members—and my hon. friend who now has that duty imposed upon him, give a most explicit denial to the assertion that they have brought influence to bear on this ground of pecuniary assistance having been given to a Member. They give an explicit denial to the imputation that they have ever used that fact in order to coerce or induce a Member to give a vote in a particular way. On their behalf and on my own, I give a most categorical and straightforward denial. I do repeat, and I think our countrymen will believe, that this is so, and that, although accusations of this sort may be made in letters and in newspapers and elsewhere, the House will best consult its own dignity by avoiding taking undue notice of this impropriety, as I think, on the part of the hon. Member for St. Pancras, and that, therefore, the proper course for us to take is to proceed, as I shall move, to the business of the day. I beg to move.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'that,' in order to insert the words 'this House do now proceed to the business of the day.'"

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): It seems necessary that I should add something to what has fallen from the Leader of the House. I think the course he has taken, which precisely follows one I recommended to the House when I was in his place, is best adapted to maintain the dignity of our proceedings. It is to be remembered that if this charge had been made, not by a Member of this House, but by a newspaper, we should have had one of those old conflicts with the Press which never yet redounded to the credit of the House. I do not think we ought to take a different measure with regard to one of our own Members from that which we are prepared to take in reference to the owner of a paper. That being so, I do not see that any better course can be put before the House than that recommended on the authority of its Leader. I have not the least doubt that what he says about his own Party is absolutely true, and if a similar assurance is required with regard to that Party of which I am a member, that assurance I am quite ready to give. Let me say further, that I hope the hon. Gentleman, against whom I trust we do not intend to proceed, will himself see the propriety, when he is called at your instance, Sir, of expressing his regret for what has fallen from him. Whether or not he chooses to take that course, which is the right and best course, I am convinced that it would not be to the honour and dignity of this House to proceed further with the matter.

LORD R. CECIL said he was afraid that personally he could not accept the suggestion made by the Leader of the House, even though it had been supported by his right hon. friend. The question of a breach of privilege committed by a newspaper was really and substantially different altogether from a breach of privilege by a Member of that House, They ordered the editor to attend and they reprimanded him. That was not a result open to a Member of that House and it was a substantial reason why he was personally unable to accept the suggestion. It had been said, and no doubt truly said by the right hon. Gentlemen, that, so far as they knew, there was no truth in the charge made by the hon. Member; but he thought it of enormous importance to Members of that House that this should be stated, not only on the authority of right hon. Gentlemen, but by clear evidence and a searching investigation. He saw no method of making that investigation except by appointing a Select Committee, and he thought the House would be very ill-advised indeed if it left itself open to the charge that, after an accusation undoubtedly affecting its honour, publicly made, and publicly brought to its notice, it prevented the investigation of that charge. It was a matter in which every Member of the House had as great an interest even as right hon. Gentlemen sitting on the Front Opposition Bench and the Treasury Bench. They were all guardians of the honour of the House, and he appealed to hon. Members to support him in the division which he was forced to take in order to ascertain what the feeling of the House was in the matter.

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe) said the Prime Minister had made a reference in his speech to the Labour Party, though he did not think the right hon. Gentleman had any ill-will in what he said; but some of his hon. friends seemed to think that the reference conveyed the idea that they were a subsidised Party ["No."] Some of his hon. friends he knew took that view, and he wanted to correct the impression. So far as the Labour Party were concerned, he could safely say that whatever money they received all information in regard to it was public property. The subscriptions they received from their people all over the country, and their payments were published quarterly, after having been duly audited. As far as they were concerned, they were perfectly willing that there should be an inquiry.

MR. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan) said that as a Member comparatively new to the House he felt some diffidence in speaking upon a subject of such vital importance to the well-being of Parliament, and on which such opinions had been expressed by the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition. There could be little doubt that some customs or practices were handed down which perhaps without being actually culpable, did call for amendment, and this matter, he believed, touched upon one of these. Were they to refuse to take the course which led to investigation and possible reform, it seemed to him they would lose, and justly lose, some of the confidence of the country. It would be held that they were afraid to look into the real state of affairs. For that reason he supported the Motion of the noble and learned Member for Marylebone.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) said that charges of a most serious character had been made by a Member of that House, and what did the

Prime Minister say in reply? He said he had consulted the Home Secretary and the Patronage Secretary, who had informed him that neither in this nor the last Parliament had any influence been brought to bear on the ground of pecuniary assistance having been given to the party. Was the Prime Minister prepared to get up and state that honours had never been conferred for payments made? If the Prime Minister would get up and say——

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order. That is not the point. It is true that some imputations of that kind are contained in the letter, but that is not the point of privilege which has been raised.

Mr. MARKHAM said the Patronage Secretary could not deal with the matter.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL pointed out that the noble Lord's Resolution was divided into two parts, and the second part asked that a Select Committee should be appointed. The allegation in the letter was that honours were bought and sold, and they wanted to know whether that was true or not.

Mr. MARKHAM said he would deal with the matter in accordance with the latter part of the noble Lord's Resolution. The question before the House was a very simple one. It was a notorious fact that honours were bought and sold for political services, and this charge had been made before, not only by the hon. Member for East St. Pancras but also by the late Member for Northampton. He was prepared to give an instance during the time of the late administration where an honour was given for the rendering of a political service.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member appears to be mixing up two things. Assuming the allegation which he makes is true, that would not constitute a breach of privilege. The hon. Member is not confining his remarks to the breach of privilege, but he is raising constitutional questions which are not relevant to the question before the House.

Mr. MARKHAM said that if the Prime Minister would rise in his place and say that the allegations contained in the letter were unfounded he was prepared to vote against this Resolution.

*Mr. SPEAKER: It would not be in order for the Prime Minister to do that.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL thought hon. Members were at liberty to consider whether the whole contents of the document constituted a breach of privilege or not. The document contained a very serious charge, not against any particular Minister, but against successive Ministers of corrupt conduct.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order. The point the hon. Member is raising is not, as I have already pointed out, relevant to the matter we are now discussing, and he must not raise that question again.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 120; Noes, 235. (Division List No. 282.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ambrose, Robert
Atherley-Jones, L.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring,Capt.Hn.G.(Winchester
Beauchamp, E.
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cleland, J. W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Fletcher, J. S.
Flynn, James Christopher
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gilhooly, James
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)

Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edmd's
Hills, J. W.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hunt, Rowland
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster)
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Liddell, Henry
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Micking, Major G.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Meagher, Michael
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Mooney, J. J.
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rose, Charles Day
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Steadman, W. C.
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Verney, F. W.
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Lord Robert Cecil and Mr. Markham.

NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn Sir Alex. F.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Beale, W. P.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boulton, A. C. F.
Branch, James
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Bull, Sir William James
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clough, William
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Helmsley, Viscount
Henry, Charles S.
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamont, Norman
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S).
Lonsdale, John Brownlee

Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdonald,J.M. (FalkirkB'ghs.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
Mallet, Charles E.
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Menzies, Walter
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morse, L. L.
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pease,Herbert Pike (Darlington
Perks, Robert William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price,RobertJohn (Norfolk,E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Rees, J. D.
Richards,Thomas (W.Monmth.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson,Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Thornton, Percy M.
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Valentia, Viscount
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Williamson, A.
Wilson, Hon. C.H.W. (Hull,W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Proposed words added.

Main Question, as amended, put and agreed to.

Resolved, "That this House do now proceed to the business of the day."

PETTY SESSIONS CLERKS (IRELAND) BILL.

Reported, with Amendments, from Standing Committee A.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 251.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 251.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration to-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 276.]

POST OFFICE SERVANTS.

Ordered, "That the Minutes of the Evidence taken before the Select Committee on Post Office Servants in Session 1906, be referred to the Select Committee on Post Office Servants."—(*Mr. Hobhouse.*)

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C. (added in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. Lambert; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. Bennett.

Report to lie upon the Table.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (COLONIAL PREFERENCE).

Ordered, "That the proceedings on the Motion relating to Colonial Preference if under discussion at Eleven o'clock this night, be not interrupted under the Standing Order (Sittings of the House."—(*Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*)

COLONIAL PREFERENCE.

*Mr. LYTTELTON (St. George's, Hanover Square) moved a Resolution expressing regret that His Majesty's Government had declined the invitation unanimously preferred by the Prime Ministers of the self-governing Colonies to consider favourably any form of Colonial Preference, or any measures for closer commercial union of the Empire on a preferential basis. He said: The Imperial Conference terminated its labours on 15th May last, and the full Report of its proceedings was issued at a considerably later, though I do not say an unduly late date. That Report, deeply interesting as it is, discloses to us fully the proceedings at the Conference. It shows that the Colonial statesmen who were there present wrestling with a problem which, I think, in our political history is unique in interest, greatness, and difficulty—I mean the problem how to interlock the communities which were founded by the toil and adventure of our race in a more stable and durable union—how to maintain the trade and territory which were founded by our forefathers, founded it may be in times more fortunate than the present, but which it is our duty at a moment of fierce competition, and in the presence of colossal rivals, to maintain if we can by peaceable and intelligent organisation. For eight or nine days the great subject of preferential trade was debated in the Conference. There were other expedients proposed which I do not underrate, but upon the question of preferential trade at the Conference there was absolute unanimity on the part of all the Colonial statesmen who were present. Those statesmen, many of whom are democrats, and many of whom are Radicals, repudiated from the outset in earnest, even in passionate language, any desire to increase the burdens of the poor in this country. They agreed that the question was not one of free trade and protection—and although I quite admit that I anticipate hearing in this debate, as we have heard on former occasions, these words used, chiefly, I think, as thought-saving appliances, I may quote what the Chancellor of the Exchequer said at the Conference, that the use of these general terms without their precise definition is, at any rate, calculated rather to generate heat than to generate light. We on these Benches, I think, are in absolute accord with the Colonial statesmen as to the main proposition. We say that already per head of the population this country derives a greater revenue than any country in the world from import duties on articles of general consumption. We say that the obvious necessities of this country, as is admitted, I think, on both sides of the House, will require an addition to, and extension of, those duties, and we hold that in raising revenue now and in the future we should show some allegiance to the principle of the wider citizenship of the Empire, and that we should give some fiscal favour to our own citizens as against those of foreign countries. But against the unanimous wish and request of the Colonial statesmen at the Conference, an unqualified rejection was given to the demand, a rejection not of detail but of principle, and I think I am right in saying that, if I except the President of the Board of Trade, the end of this Conference shows that so far as His Majesty's Government are concerned, we have failed "one painful inch to gain." I say it is impossible for us who sit here as a Party on these Benches to let this matter pass without an expression of opinion upon it in the House of Commons. To do so would be to show an ingratitude which, I think, would be deplorable to those Colonial statesmen who advocated the cause with such brilliancy, such earnestness, and such power, and also to that great statesman, my right hon. friend the Member for West Birmingham, who initiated this matter with such splendid courage, and who has pursued it with such strenuous energy, even at the expense of health, and who showed in his predictions with regard to the view of the Colonies so remarkable a prescience and so remarkable an appreciation of what that view would be. I do not propose to notice any of those accusations which have appeared in the Press about rudeness, or the like, in regard to the action of His Majesty's Government at the Conference. I frankly admit that I do not think these accusations were justified. It would be presumptuous of me to criticise in any sense the courtesy of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's manner towards the Premiers. But, unfortunately, since the Conference, the Under-Secretary for the Colonies has made two speeches. The right hon. Gentleman had imposed upon himself at the Conference an unwonted, and I am grateful to add, except upon one occasion, an almost unbroken silence. On one occasion, however, he did make a speech which was for the greater part devoted to showing the terrific consequences which might ensue if this question were to be debated by Englishmen in Parliament on Budget and other occasions. He spoke of the sullen hatreds, and the awful shocks which might arise when such discussions took place. It might have been supposed, in making his two speeches afterwards, that he was endeavouring to justify these portentous prophecies inciting natural resentment and disgust at his method of treating the subject—a method which was in woeful contrast to that of his colleagues who addressed the Conference on the subject. At Edinburgh he took upon himself to lecture the Colonial statesmen upon their duties as guests, as he was pleased to say, of the Government. I am afraid that on a later occasion he did even worse than that. He said no new facts had been produced at the Conference, and no new offer had been made, except an offer to take anything we might care to give, an offer, he added, which we might get from many quarters, and the right hon. Gentleman used other expressions on which I do not propose to comment. I think that every Colonial statesman knows what view I should take of them, and what are the views of those who sit behind me. The Under-Secretary devotes his talents very often to the arguing of questions fairly enough here, but he speaks from time to time, as it were, through a megaphone to larger numbers and lower intelligences. I think that on both these occasions he was using the megaphone. In view of the admissions which were made by the President of the Board of Trade and of the arguments which were pursued both by him and by the Chancellor of the Exchequer—arguments which I may fairly describe as not so much an endeavour to refute the case of the Colonies as to disclose what they believe to be the difficulties which our system imposes upon us in meeting them—I am relieved of a very considerable portion of that which otherwise it would be necessary to do. Let me read an extract, a very brief one, from the speech of the President of the Board of Trade, which relieves me of what otherwise would be a large portion of my task. He said—

> "In Britain we have the greatest market in the world. We are the greatest purchasers of produce raised or manufactured outside our own boundaries. A very large proportion of this produce could very well be raised in the Colonies, and any reasonable and workable plan that would tend to increase the proportion of the produce which is bought by us from the Colonies, and by the Colonies from us and from each other, must necessarily enhance the resources of the Empire as a whole. A considerable part of the surplus population of the United Kingdom which now goes to foreign lands in search of a livelihood might find it to its profit to pitch its tents somewhere under the flag, and the Empire would gain in riches of both materials and of men. We agree with our Colonial comrades that all this is worth concerted effort, even if the effort at the outset costs us something. The Federation of the Commonwealths is worth some sacrifice, for we never know when its strength may be essential to the great cause of human freedom, and that is priceless."

The right hon. Gentleman might have pursued the topic and have urged the great need of population in the Colonies. He might have urged, and we do urge, that the burden of defence which this country in the main bears would be very easily shared were these populations to be increased. We say our own market would increase both in stability and security if customers, friendly customers of friendly communities, were increased in power and number. We have a surplus of able and skilled craftsmen whom we send out every year, not, I am afraid, to our Colonies, but to swell and increase the industrial strength of foreign competitors. The great market of this country has the power of calling into being populations in other countries. The House will need no assurance of that if they think of the population which has been created and called into being in the United States, Argentina, and the industrial parts of France and Germany. I do not think anybody can doubt that these populations have been created and brought into being by the privilege of supplying the great English market. We have seen the dissipation and dispersal of this great industrial strength of the country. It is not too late to retrieve that at present. Surely we may yet organise, concentrate, and collect those populations within the boundaries of the Empire. We have also to consider our foreign policy. No one, I think, would for a moment hesitate to say that our foreign policy would gain greatly in strength in Colonial matters if we had more common interests with the Colonies. I may recall the case of Newfoundland, in which lately a divergence of interest has manifested itself in the commercial aspirations of that country and ourselves. The Prime Minister of Newfoundland some years ago nearly succeeded in making a treaty with the United States for reciprocal privileges between that country and his own. It was a treaty in prejudice to the commercial position of this country. The Senate threw it out; Newfoundland retaliated. Newfoundland called upon us, whose interests were adversely affected by the Treaty, to assist her in the retaliatory processes against the United States. We have done our very best to aid her by putting such pressure as was possible upon that country. The whole situation, however, has placed us in a difficult and sometimes even a ridiculous position. The moral of it is that cases have arisen and may arise in the future in respect to the Colonies in which divergent interests in commercial affairs may make themselves evident; and in the absence of some preferential trade between them and the Mother Country there is no effective counterpoise against the position of difficulty in which they find themselves in wishing to enforce their views. We have never, upon this side of the House, for a moment underrated what has been called the sentimental tie which exists between ourselves and the Coloneis. We acknowledge its force gratefully and with enthusiasm, but no one can fail to feel some apprehension that as generations roll on, and as the time when the first Colonists left the Mother Country becomes more distant, you require some assistance to that sentimental tie. There is a danger of its being atrophied by efflux of time. You ought to renew it if possible by the process of mutual knowledge and of human intercourse. The commercial bond of preference which we advocate is so wide and so comprehensive, and brings so many citizens within its embrace, that it gives constant opportunity both for renewing the mutual knowledge which is easily lost and for that human intercourse. for which, but for it, few opportunities would exist. The last men in the world who ought to deny that and to deny the force and the strength of the tie of commercial unity are the professed followers of Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright. Those great men believed that commercial ties were so strong that they would overleap the barriers of race. Surely we may ask their followers to believe that at any rate those ties will have great effect. They are not desired to overleap the barriers of race, but to strengthen the cords of kinship which already are in existence. At any rate at the close of three or four years discussion we may say that the argument which apparently had so much weight with the Prime Minister, that commercial interests were sordid interests, has been blown to the winds, not merely by those of our Party, but by his own President of the Board of Trade and by the voice of the Gentleman who in this House represents the Colonies. That unhappy and belated sentiment, at any rate, I think is dead. It has been killed by Gentlemen on this side of the House, it has been killed by every official who speaks with any knowledge of the Government of the day. They, as strongly as anybody, and no one more strongly than the President of the Board of Trade, have asserted that they desire, if they can see the means, to increase those ties and to strengthen and add to the commercial interests already existing between the Mother Country and the Colonies. Let me summarise what I have said. Preferential trade was requested by the unanimous voice of Colonial statesmen. It would stimulate, if granted, the opportunities for intercourse, it would relieve many difficulties in foreign policy, and promote consistency and coherence by transforming what are now divergent interests into common interests. It would invigorate and consolidate Colonial populations, and it would, by the organisation of friendly custom, give confidence and security to British industry. All this and much more was of course argued at the Colonial Conference, and what was the result? The reply was given by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who said in relation to a proposal of Dr. Jameson merely to consider a preference on existing duties to South Africa—

> "It means that we are to consider the question whether we shall treat the foreigners and the Colonies, as it were, differently, and that we are not able to do."

Surely it is a strange paradox which appears on the face of that assertion. I defy anybody to sustain the proposition that a Government cannot show favour as between those who are our fellow-subjects and those who are not. I am unable to conceive any definition of country or nationality with which this amazing proposition can be reconciled. We are bound, to the last shilling of our resources, and to the last drop of blood, to protect our Colonies. They give us freely and we accept their services in time of war; therefore, is it tenable to say that we shall not give them any preference or favour in regard to commerce? I am bound to say that, although the Chancellor of the Exchequer did not say anything about "squalid bonds," or use any such obsolete and, as I think, preposterous phrase, he did argue the proposition which I have just read to the House, and I propose to examine that argument. It is not unimportant that, at the very outset and in the very forefront of his arguments before the Conference, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in an eloquent passage, dealt once more with significant irrelevance with the old subject of the loss of the United States and fiscal autonomy. I venture to say that these topics had no more to do with preferential trade and the arguments for it, any more than they have with the loss of Alsace to the French. Long before the right hon. Gentleman addressed himself to this subject, the fiscal autonomy of the Colonies was asserted in the strongest terms by the late Lord Salisbury, and I challenge the right hon. Gentleman to show a single word from any person of responsibility in this country which impeaches or invades fiscal autonomy in these proposals, or asserts that the proposition of taxing the Colonists against their will for revenue—a procedure which cost us America—is suggested.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fife, E.): I never said anything of the kind. I said, "We have given our Colonies fiscal autonomy," and mentioned as one of the reasons against the proposals submitted the hideous mistake we made when we tried to interfere with the fiscal autonomy across the Atlantic. My argument was that we have given the Colonies fiscal autonomy, and we do not propose to interfere with it, but we do claim the same autonomy for ourselves.

*MR. LYTTELTON: Neither the late Lord Salisbury nor anyone else wished or proposed to impugn our fiscal autonomy, and I do not see any force in the interruption. What is significant is the irrelevance of these two topics. The right hon. Gentleman went on to describe, of in course an interesting manner, the situation of this country, and I do not think that anyone on this side of the House will quarrel with what he said as to that. He spoke of the 43,000,000 of citizens of this country bearing the whole debt incurred in acquiring—and most of that now spent in maintaining—the resources of the Empire. He also spoke of these 43,000,000 being largely dependent on extraneous sources for food supply and raw material. Yes, but the right hon. Gentleman failed to observe that with the rapidly advancing competition the supply of raw material should be fostered within our own borders and the food supply thus available should be so great as to leave us in no practical danger in time of war or times of danger and difficulty. Then again he went on to say—and here again I have little to fault find with—that the real strength and wealth of the country ultimately depend in a large degree upon the productive capacity and skill of the people; that this country was the place of intermediate business, the clearing house of nations, and he emphasised the importance and magnitude of our shipping trade. There again I do not think many of us on this side of the House will quarrel with what he said. But I would again remind him that intermediate business and carrying trade tend to follow and attend on productive capacity, that the real wealth of a country depends on the brain craft and hand craft of her citizens, and history shows that the loss of that capacity ultimately brings with it the loss of the industries which gather round energetic productivity. The Chancellor of the Exchequer endeavoured to minimise that which we might expect from the Colonies if preference is given, but the President of the Board of Trade admitted the enormous benefit which has been derived, because he said—

> "Let me express for the Board of Trade our appreciation of the enormous advantage conferred upon British manufacturers by the preference given in the Colonial markets by recent tariff adjustments."

That is a candid and honourable admission by the Board of Trade of that for which we have for years contended. It was pointed out by Sir Joseph Ward, who was alluded to by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that Australasia and New Zealand were the third best purchasing customers of the British Empire in the whole world. The population of those Colonies is 5,000,000—hardly the population of London; they are communities which in regard to population may be said to be almost in their infancy. Our greatest customer is India. India takes our goods to the amount of £44,000,000 a year; Germany stands second with £29,000,000, and Australia and New Zealand third with about £25,000,000, speaking in round figures. So here you have a population of 5,000,000 annually purchasing to the extent of more than a half of the Indian population of 239,000,000 and only a trifle less than the 60,000,000 of Germany. If you consider these facts they are most pregnant, and as the population of Australasia grows we might promote an enormous trade if we organised a system of preference. The next argument of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was that it was the settled policy of this country to tax only for revenue purposes and never for any ulterior purposes. If any utility other than cash for the Treasury results from the imposition of a duty, then that duty is tainted with unorthodoxy. That really is a senseless doctrine. How can it be contended that it is not right to get money from A because that may possibly, as a result, do some good to B and C? That is, I know, an argument which has been claimed as a free trade argument, but I do not think it has anything to do with free trade. If a man has to pay a tax or a duty which he thinks is fair, I can conceive that he would pay it with much greater alacrity if his friend round the corner gets some advantage from it. But we know the countervailing argument. The Chancellor of the Exchequer asked what we were to prefer. The Colonies, he said, sent us £27,500,000 in foodstuffs, £32,500,000 in raw material, and £5,500,000 in manufactured goods; and he went on to say that we might surely neglect the £5,500,000 of manufactured goods. And if the duty on manufactured goods is not considered and if you are to show a preference you must resort to a duty on raw material or food.

[In reply to an interruption from an hon. Member, who was inaudible in the gallery, Mr. Lyttelton said these were the figures, and he believed they were substantially correct.]

Mr. ASQUITH: I was accused of having made a trifling mistake of £62,000,000. I am glad to take the right hon. Gentleman's handsome acknowledgment that the figures are substantially correct.

***Mr. LYTTELTON**: I do not think the right hon. Gentleman's interruption is quite relevant. I have made what he considers to be a handsome admission. The reason for the misapprehension, if it existed—I have not followed the controversy—was due to the action of the right hon. Gentleman's own Government in preventing the publication of a verbatim report.

Mr. ASQUITH: That is a statement which I cannot allow to pass. On the contrary, the non-publication of a daily verbatim report, although I do not know what newspaper could have printed it, was not due to the action of his Majesty's

Ministers; it was due to the resolution of the Conference itself. Nobody suffered more from the curtailment of the report than the representatives of the Government.

*MR. LYTTELTON: Of course I accept what the right hon. Gentleman says, and I will resume the argument which he interupted. It is considered necessary by the right hon. Gentleman, if we are to give the Colonies what he calls fair treatment, to tax raw material. I absolutely deny that. It is another illustration of the fallacy of supposing that all men expect that whatever diversity may exist in their products they can be taxed alike. It is not so. I have asked colonial statesmen whose countries have not the power of producing any other than raw material whether they expect raw material to be taxed in this country. They do not expect it for a moment. It is contrary to the existing practice, not only of this, but even of every intelligent protectionist country, and it is absolutely preposterous to credit colonial statesmen with the idea that they would be aggrieved because, having nothing on which preference could be shown except raw material, other countries in a happier position got a preference which they could not share. Then there is the question of food—the £27,500,000 on food. The Chancellor of the Exchequer seems to consider that when food is in question that is a barrier against all further rational discussion. My complaint against the Government is that in regard to preferential trade they will not even make a start upon the existing tariff. The Chancellor of the Exchequer says we cannot give a preference on wine or anything in which there is alcohol. Why not? What is the reason? The experience of the Colonies is against this dogma; Canada and Australia, to mention instances, grant such preferences *inter se.* What is the objection to it? What was the French treaty but a preference given to foreigners?

MR. ASQUITH: That is not a preference at all, but is given to everybody all round.

*MR. LYTTELTON: No doubt other treaties followed; but if you look, not at the form, but at the substance, and take Cape wine as compared with French light wine the effect of the French treaty was to give a preference to the foreigner over the colonial producer. One result of the regulation of the duties on wine in favour of France is, amongst others, to diminish, almost to extinguish, the export of Cape wine.

MR. ASQUITH: The preference given is to light as compared with heavy wine to the whole world equally. Spain and Portugal suffer as much as anybody else.

*MR. LYTTELTON: I say again that the effect of the treaty from the point of view I am now taking was to prejudice the business in Cape wine, and in that sense to give a preference to the French wine. The question of the price of commodities which are taxed and how far it is affected by the tax is vitally important. It is impossible with any intellectual honesty to argue that question without in the first place seeing what the supply is, seeing what the foreign country is which supplies it and upon whose supplies the duty would be laid, and seeing whether that country could afford to lose our markets. The question is not to be disposed of by irrelevant talk on platforms. Unless we come calmly to investigate the question and are prepared to discuss it over a table with experts with a view to proving that the duty when placed on a commodity would necessarily enhance the price, we can not with intellectual honesty and with certainty say that it would do so. Take the United States and some of their great exports. You must inquire whether it would be more valuable to the United States to maintain our market at a profit by paying a duty rather than lose it if they insisted on the profit they are now making. That is a preliminary inquiry to any sincere and careful opinion on this subject. It is an element in the question of price, and that, I venture to say, no one who thinks fit will deny. What next? Another inquiry which must be equally and calmly made, is what would be the result of taxes on foreign food in stimulating the area of production in the Colonies. Thirdly, contrary to his usual fairness in this matter, the President of the Board of Trade argued from the experience of France, Germany, and the United States that a small duty must necessarily, under the pressure of interest become a large one. I say with the utmost seriousness that that argument is not sound, nor can it be even plausibly addressed to the people of this country. This country has an urban and industrial democracy, and the vast majority of the voting power of the country belongs to the urban industries, and I say, without fear of contradiction, that it is impossible to put a protective tax at all upon food; but to say that if a low duty for revenue purposes were placed on food, or any article of food, it might be pushed to the extent which Germany and France have pushed taxation on those commodities, is, I submit, in view of the pressure of this urban democratic vote, neither a substantial nor a serious argument. I gain a gleam of hope, and it is the only gleam I am able to get, from the Chancellor of the Exchequer's speech, for I find there is a modification of some of the arguments with which this controversy was begun. On page 321 of the Blue-book, the Chancellor of the Exchequer said—

> "When you impose a moderate duty on a commodity, which is necessary to life or industry, and when the commodity is of such a kind that you cannot substantially make up the supplies which you want from domestic sources, given those two conditions—and I carefully limit my proposition in that way—sooner or later, though the process may be delayed or deflected, that duty appears in added cost to the consumer."

MR. ASQUITH: I have always said it.

*MR. LYTTELTON: That is a perfectly fair and right qualification of the general proposition which is made by my right hon. friend, but is it not a fair inference that my right hon. friend means from sources either domestic or Imperial upon which no duty is levied? I do not ask the House to believe, without careful study of the matter, that these sources of supply are adequate; but I have my own firm conviction that they would be. What I ask the House to accept is, that the British Government had no right to refuse to inquire into or discuss this matter, and I affirm that this careful proposition of the Chancellor of the Exchequer can be satisfied, that you can show there would be an adequate supply of wheat coming from Imperial sources, and therefore untaxed, sufficient to keep down the price, which can only be kept down by effective competition among those who command the supply. Let me, therefore, say that there is a case for serious discussion, namely, that there would be no addition to the price even if a small duty were imposed, for there would be sufficient untaxed supplies from our own Colonies to keep down the price. I am dealing with a most difficult and complicated subject, and I have detained the House at some length, and I will not be longer than a minute or two more. I cannot but think that the *non possumus* attitude of the Government is due to a failure to grasp in its fulness the principle of wider citizenship that we on our side take as the foundation of our opinions. You cannot expect a Yorkshireman to think the same of Canada as of his own county; and you cannot expect a man of Victoria to think the same of Kent as he does of his own home. But the actual devotion of a man to his home, however strong, should not exclude, indeed should include, a comprehensive patriotism; his imagination should grasp the wider scope of the federation of the States of Empire. This sentiment is growing apace. Once it is fully grasped I believe the people of this country will sweep aside the arguments, technical and, I venture to think, narrow, which weigh with the Liberal Party at the present time. The path will then be cleared for the attainment of that ideal to which, I am convinced, the majority of our fellow-countrymen aspire.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House regrets that His Majesty's Government have declined the invitation unanimously preferred by the Prime Ministers of the Self-governing Colonies to consider favourably any form of Colonial Preference or any measures for closer commercial union of the Empire on a preferential basis."—(*Mr. Lyttleton.*)

*MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple), who rose to move an Amendment to the effect that the permanent unity of the British Empire would not be secured through a system of preferential duties based upon the protective taxation of food, said it was with considerable diffidence he rose to follow the right hon.

Gentleman. He fully recognised the importance of the great issues which were involved, and, if allowed to say so, he fully recognised the great ability and eloquence with which the right hon. Gentleman had stated his case. Before proceeding to the main question, he might be permitted to say how much he regretted the absence of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. He had not had the privilege of having personal relations with the right hon. Gentleman, but he had been long enough a Member of the House to be able to appreciate the virtues of political opponents, and he could only say that he sincerely trusted that the next time they debated the subject in that House the right hon. Gentleman might be present to give them his views with his usual clear and straightforward directness. The right hon. Gentleman who submitted this Motion had directed a great portion of his speech to an attack on the Chancellor of the Exchequer for refusing to give preference on articles which were at present dutiable, and complained that the Government would not make a start upon those existing duties. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken of this matter almost as if it was an entirely new question, whereas, in fact, it was as old as the hills. It had been raised, he thought, at every Conference that had been held. It was raised at the very first Conference held in 1887, when Sir Samuel Griffith, Premier of Queensland, moved—

> "That if any member of the Empire thinks fit for any reason to impose Customs charges upon goods imported from abroad, it should be recognised that goods coming from British possessions should be subjected to a lighter duty than those coming from foreign countries."

And what did Lord Salisbury reply? He said—

> "The resolutions which were come to in respect to our fiscal policy forty years ago, set any such possibility entirely aside."

Lord Salisbury was at that time leader of a great free-trade Party, and the present Prime Minister was the leader of the greatest free-trade Party this country had ever seen. Yet the House was asked to censure the Government for doing what Lord Salisbury did in 1887 under precisely similar conditions. They were asked to give a preference on articles which were not dutiable, and there could be no doubt whatever that this would be a breach of their free-trade policy. It would mean the imposition of taxes for purposes other than revenue, and it would mean also the protection and encouragement of certain favoured colonial trades. Of course it would be said that the duty was only to be a small one. He was a great believer in the principle *obsta principiis;* and the Government would have been false to their pledges, and false to the confidence which the country placed in them, if they had acceded to the request of the Colonial Premiers in this respect. The right hon. Gentleman had directed a considerable portion of his speech to the question of wine which now had a duty. He would only ask this. Did hon. and right hon. Gentlemen when they entertained their friends, give them Colonial wines to drink, or Boer tobacco to smoke? Of course, they did nothing of the kind. They gave their friends the best that could be supplied. When Colonial wine and Colonial tobacco became the best in quality, they would have a large sale in this country. But under existing circumstances the only people who would suffer would be the working classes. If they gave a remission of duty on Colonial tobacco, it would be necessary, for revenue, to raise the duty on other tobaccos, and the only people who would suffer in that case would be the working classes. They could not make a rich man, however large the tax, refrain from smoking his havanna; but they could make the poor man smoke another and worse kind of tobacco in his pipe, and every time he did so his loyalty and affection for the Colonies would evaporate in smoke. But surely all this talk about the question of dutiable articles was a case of "Much ado about nothing," when they considered the figures. The total imports from Canada in 1906 amounted to £28,035,036, and out of that only £15,368 was subject to duty. Out of nearly £16,000,000 of imports from New Zealand in 1906, only £163 was subject to duty. Surely, it was not worth while going through so much to do so little. Surely, it was not worth while to commit a breach of the great free-trade policy in order to give a preference on £163. The right hon. Gentleman had made a determined effort to revive the political side of this question, and had pleaded that some system of preference was a necessity to the unity of the Empire. He had been under the impression that during the last few months that side of the question had undergone a material change. When this controversy was first started there were two main arguments put forward in support of it. The first was the political argument that unless a policy of preference were adopted it would mean the separation of this country from the Colonies. The second was the economic argument, that it would be to our mutual advantage to have a system of preference. Before the right hon. Gentleman spoke to-day, he thought the speeches delivered at the Conference had absolutely killed the political side, and the only point left to consider was what were their material interests. In other words, the question had come down from the region of high politics into the arena of the produce market. He was glad of it, because it would have been a most deplorable thing if the loyalty of the Colonies had been made a pawn in the political game. There was no anti-Colonial Party in the House. They all looked upon the Colonies with affection and admiration, and were ready to do their best to promote their success and prosperity consistently with the best interests of the Empire. When this controversy was first started, however, it was on quite different lines, because they were then told that unless they were prepared to tax food they must be prepared to lose the Colonies. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham said in a speech at Glasgow in 1903—

> "If you want to prevent separation you must put a tax on food."

In the same year at the Constitutional Club the same right hon. Gentleman said—

> "A system of preferential tariffs is the only system by which the Empire can be kept together."

Talk of that kind could now be swept into the limbo of obscurity, because no Colonial statesman of any importance would say that a system of preference was necessary for the unity of the Empire. He would give the House a few quotations from the speeches of the Colonial Premiers on this point. Mr. Deakin advocated this question practically from the same point of view as the right hon. Gentleman, but he used these words—

> "The possibilities of the severance of this Empire, of its defeat and destruction, are too painful to contemplate, and, thank heaven, in no prospect that we can see."

Mr. Soares.

When Mr. Deakin used those words he was very well aware of the results of the last general election, and he knew that the Government majority were pledged to no preference and that the whole of the Labour Party were against it. And notwithstanding these facts he said that, "the severance of the Empire was in no prospect that he could see." Sir Wilfred Laurier, in the eloquent speech he delivered at the Albert Hall in April, 1907, said—

> "If preference for preference were not given, however, their loyalty would remain the same. The courageous ancient Gauls were afraid of only one thing, and that was the canopy of heaven falling. Those who entertain a doubt of the loyalty of Canada may just as well fear the fall of the blue vault of heaven."

Then there was General Botha who, in his blunt manner, said—

> "I only want to say this, that although no preference is given by the Mother Country to the Transvaal the bond between the Transvaal and the Mother Country will not thereby be weakened."

He thought they might in future regard with absolute equanimity the danger of separation. They had been told that the Colonies might make reciprocity treaties with foreign nations. He did not think there was the slightest danger of that, because at the present time we gave the Colonies better terms than any other nation, and so long as that continued they were not likely to give foreign nations better terms than the Mother Country. The trend of events was quite the other way, because the Colonies were beginning to recognise the benefits they derived from their connection with the Mother Country, and were giving us a preference so far as they could do so consistently with their fiscal policy of protection. Was that to be wondered at when they remembered the enormous benefits which the Colonies derived from their connection with the Mother Country? Practically the whole defence of the Navy was paid for by this country, for it cost £30,000,000, towards which the Colonies contributed about £500,000. The House had spent nearly the whole of this session passing the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, under which they provided a quick striking force to meet the necessities of the Empire. This country also provided the embassies and lent the Colonies enormous sums of money. Under the Colonial Trustees Act Colonial Government stocks had been made Trustee Stocks. That affected hundreds of millions invested in Colonial Government stocks, and would be of the greatest possible benefit to any new country in process of development. He was glad to think that the Colonies were gradually recognising these facts, and so long as they did that they were not likely to bother their heads about separation. They had to look at the question from a material and a business point of view. They had been told that there had been an offer. He did not wish to quibble with the right hon. Gentleman about the use of a word, but if the Colonial Premiers had made any offer it was about the vaguest he had ever seen. It seemed to him that the Colonies offered something which they could not define in exchange for something which they were not prepared to indicate. Mr. Deakin said he was prepared to give a new Bill of Preferences, but he absolutely refused to say what he proposed to put into it. There was an absolute disagreement as to the terms of the offer between preferentialists here and in the Colonies. The right hon. Gentleman had ridiculed the idea of taxing raw material and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham had done the same thing. What did Mr. Deakin say? He said—

> "It does appear to us from our point of view that we are not suggesting anything unreasonable in the proposals we make even in respect of food stuffs and raw material."

Mr. Deakin used those words, and therefore there was in them a direct point of issue as to the terms of the offer. Then as to the question of the cost of the offer, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham said in 1903—

> "I do not believe there will be any sacrifice at all,"

and yet in the month of June the same right hon. Gentleman wrote in a letter to Sir Oliver Lodge—

> "Probably by the next Conference in 1911 the British people will be prepared to make whatever sacrifice is necessary."

According to those statements, in 1903 there was to be no sacrifice, but in 1911 there was to be a sacrifice. If the author of this policy did not know whether there was to be a sacrifice or not how were they to know in the House of Commons? At any rate one Colonial Prime Minister at the Conference did know whether there was to be a sacrifice or not, because Dr. Jameson said—

> "But I take it that we are here to-day to try and get something from the Imperial Government. I am not going to split words about it. I am not going to say we are making a wonderfully generous offer from the Colonies."

Evidently Dr. Jameson was contemplating another raid, not on a Republic this time but upon the pockets of the British taxpayer. He believed that Dr. Jameson was right, because if tariff reform was ever introduced there would be a great sacrifice, and he was glad that the onus of proving that sacrifice rested upon right hon. Gentlemen opposite. There was one thought which was very consoling with regard to the whole of this question, and it was that whether the Opposition persisted in adhering to this policy of preference or not and whether they ever carried it or not, in no circumstances would the loyalty of the Colonies and the unity of the Empire be affected. He would now say a few words about the Amendment he proposed to move. This Amendment had a history behind it. In the last Parliament they were all most anxious to discuss the fiscal question, but the opportunities offered them were few and far between.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): You had twelve opportunities in one session.

*MR. SOARES said he knew they took every opportunity they could get. The right hon. Gentleman the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies succeeded in winning the first place in the ballot, and he moved the Resolution which he had put down as an Amendment to-day. What was the position at that time? The Leader of the Opposition had then no settled convictions.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is not the case, and I never said that.

*MR. SOARES said that was before St. Valentine's day.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It was not true at any time.

*MR. SOARES said he was glad to hear that the right hon. Gentleman's convictions always had been settled with regard to fiscal policy, but the principal suggestion up to that time which he had made was that the whole matter should be relegated to the dim and distant future by means of two successful general elections.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: One of them is over.

*MR. SOARES: Yes, but that could not be called a successful one. Many of the right hon. Gentleman's followers were in a similar position. They were between the Scylla of Birmingham and the Charybdis of the general election.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. The arguments the hon. Member is using do not appear to be relevant to this Amendment.

*MR. SOARES said that the Amendment which he now proposed was before the last Parliament in the identical words he was now moving. On that occasion the Leader of the Opposition moved the previous question, and they had the spectacle of timorous tariff reformers, peace loving wobblers, and timorous free traders all voting in favour of the previous question. The Leader of the Opposition could no longer shirk the issue. He would have to vote either for or against protective tariffs on food. The challenge was thrown down to the right hon. Gentleman, and it was a challenge which, he ventured to say, went to the very heart of the preference policy. No doubt they would hear quibbles in the debate with regard to the meaning of the word "protective" which he had used as describing protective tariffs on food. He had noticed that many tariff reformers in talking over the question quietly did not mind being called protectionists; it was only when they went on the platform and wanted the votes of Unionist free traders that the kaleidescope suddenly shifted and the dining-room protectionist became a platform free trader. If the policy of preference was introduced they would hear a good deal about protection, and very little about free trade. One effect of the policy of preference would be the imposition of duties for purposes other than revenue, and it would mean the artificial encouragement of various forms of Colonial trade. He had always understood that a policy of that kind meant protection, although he understood the Leader of the Opposition did not admit that definition of protection. He would say to the right hon. Gentleman that theoretical definitions of nomenclature did not matter a bit. What politicians had to do was to see that the people of this country thoroughly understood the terms used. For over fifty years the policy of the Liberal Party—let them call it a policy of "free imports," or a policy of "no taxation except for revenue purposes" if they liked—had gone by the name of free trade, and therefore the converse of that must be protection. Liberals stood for the existing policy. Hon. Gentleman opposite desired to annul, delete, and reverse that policy, and therefore while he and his friends stood by free trade they thought hon. Members opposite were obliged to take the name of protectionists whether they liked it or not. There could be no doubt that their policy was in essence as well as in name a protective policy, and he asserted without fear, in spite of what the right hon. Gentleman had said, that their policy would artificially raise the price of food. If it would not raise the price of food, why did the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham say he would omit from his tariff maize and corn? It was because, as he said, they were the food of some of the poorest of the people, and the fact that he omitted them showed conclusively what he thought would be the effect of his tariff. Was it not a fact that hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite had apppealed for support to the landed interest and to tenant famers on this very ground? The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Bordesley Division had pleaded that a fiscal reform policy involving preference would be a means of curing rural depopulation and increasing the amount of tillage in this country. Tillage could only be increased, and the wheat-growing area of this country could only be increased, by making the wheat which was grown more profitable, and that could be done only by increasing its price. Therefore the policy of hon. Members on the other side, on their own showing, tended artificially to increase the price of food. He thought the Leader of the Opposition would not deny that the artificial bolstering up of trade was a policy of protection. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, when speaking at Glasgow in October, 1903, said—

> "I propose that the corresponding tax which will have to be put on flour should give a substantial preference to the miller. I do that in order to re-establish one of our most ancient industries in this country."

That, he thought, came within the four corners of the definition which the Leader of the Opposition gave at Edinburgh with regard to protection. The great protagonist of the policy, the Member for West Birmingham, had called himself on more than one occasion a protectionist. Speaking at Birmingham in November, 1903, he said—

> "I ask you not to be guided by me—not by a protectionist, but by a free-trader."

Therefore, he was justified in saying that this Amendment was a challenge which went to the very root of the policy of the right hon. Gentleman and his friends, and he was very curious indeed to see how they would meet it. They had not been told yet, but there was one gentleman on the Front Opposition Bench who he thought, would not speak in qualified terms, namely, the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer, for he, speaking in October last year, when explaining the reasons for the defeat of the last Administration said—

> "They had by their own pledges voluntarily precluded themselves from taking any action on the great question of fiscal reform, and after a time they even abstained from divisions and discussions in the House of Commons on that subject. But that way lay disaster. . . . The effect was to paralyse the efforts of their most energetic supporters throughout the country."

He was anxious to know whether the supporters of the right hon. Gentleman were to receive another dose of paralysis as the result of that debate. If the Member for West Birmingham had been present as leader of the Party opposite, he knew how the right hon. Gentleman would have met the Amendment. In the debate to which he had already alluded the right hon. Gentleman said that if that Resolution were carried it would mean that the Government would go to the Conference with their hands tied as to the only terms on which preference could be given, the only terms being the protective taxation of food mentioned in the Amendment. He went on to say further that he did not shirk a division. The right hon. Gentleman said—

> "I confess that if I could have had my way, if I had the influence which the hon. Member attributes to me, I would have invited the Government to meet this Motion with a direct negative. That is my opinion, I do not like a challenge to be thrown down and not taken up."

The issue now before the House was perfectly clear. Did they want to give preference to the Colonies at the expense of the very poorest of the population? Did they want to consolidate the Empire on empty stomachs? Did they want by the taxation of meat, bread, and dairy produce to handicap still further the already hard lot of their poorer brethren? Or would they remain satisfied with the enthusiasm of the Colonies and sternly refuse to substitute the unnatural bond of financial interest for the natural bond of affection? He begged to move.

*MR. SIMON (Essex, Walthamstow), in seconding the Amendment, said it appeared to him to express with sufficient accuracy and clearness what was the position of the Government when they met the Colonial Premiers in Conference and gave the answer which they did. The real kernel of the complaint made by the right hon. Gentleman who moved the Resolution, and by those who supported him, was that the Government in meeting the Colonial Ministers in Conference had plainly stated their views. The Opposition could hardly expect from the Goverement an avowal in favour of Colonial preference, and their real complaint was that those who spoke for the Government at the Colonial Conference stated explicitly and clearly that which the Government believed, and that which they were sent by the country to say. That fact was clearly brought out if the House would bear in mind that this was the second occasion this year on which there had been a debate in the House on this question. An Amendment was moved to the Address by the hon. Member for Durham which anticipated the Colonial Conference, and invited the House to express regret that no reference had been made to it in the course of the King's Speech. In that debate in February the Leader of the Opposition explained clearly enough what was the view of himself and those behind him.

He said the Government ought to go into the Conference with an "open mind" on this very subject. That was the way in which the right hon. Gentleman, had he been representing this country in the Colonial Conference, would have acted. The complaint was that the Government in going forward to the Conference had declined to maintain an open mind. He would say with great respect that there were some among the right hon. Gentleman's followers who did not value the open mind quite so highly as he did himself. It was, at any rate, a possible view to take that this debate, like previous debates on this subject, had been promoted in order that the right hon. Gentleman's mind might not be quite so much open henceforth as in the past. The other complaint, embodied in the Resolution, was a complaint, if he understood it rightly, that the Government declined to consider favourably or indeed to discuss the question of Colonial preference at the Conference. The right hon. Gentleman said that he had read the greater part of the Blue Book, and he must have discovered that there was no subject at the Colonial Conference which occupied one-fifth of the time devoted to this subject of Colonial preference. It was a little difficult to understand what was the substance of the complaint that those who spoke for the Government were offhand, that they threw the thing on one side and declined to listen, to discuss, and to answer, when very nearly half of a great and bulky volume was occupied by the discussion of the subject. The right hon. Gentleman had recommended them to read Mr. Deakin's contribution to the debate. He had no doubt that most of them had read it, but he would suggest that it would be as well to read also the answer made first by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, then by the President of the Board of Trade, and he thought also by the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies. Would anybody who had read the Blue Book in its material parts really contend that no answer was given? No one expected in a threadbare controversy like this that opinions would be changed by arguments, the most subtle, eloquent, and overpowering. No one expected that. But it was one thing to say they were of the same opinion still, and quite another thing to say that those who spoke in the name of the Government did not give an elaborately reasoned view to support the opposition taken up by the Government.

Mr. LYTTELTON: The hon. and learned Gentleman will forgive me. I did not complain of the method adopted by the Government. Colonial statesmen stated their view. The Government, through the Chancellor of the Exchequer, stated yours. What I said was that I was relieved from the necessity of repeating the arguments of Colonial statesmen because it had not been attempted to answer them except by a counter statement of the Government. That was the way in which the argument was conducted.

*Mr. SIMON said that no one knew better than the right hon. Gentleman that, assuming two persons of different opinions were both going to keep to the point, it was almost necessary that one side should be expressed in terms contradictory to the views of the other. There was no other known means by which they could conduct a debate on one and the same subject, except of course the alternative course sometimes pursued by which one disputant sought to evade the point and discuss everything in heaven and earth except the particular thing in question. Hon. Members would see in the Blue Book arguments developed at considerable length, arguments of great subtlety and ingenuity, and he submitted that it was impossible to suggest that they were met with mere counter assertion. They were met by two other methods of argument: one was to ask a plain question such as the Chancellor of the Exchequer well knew how to ask: "What is the preference about which you speak and upon what do you say it can be given?" The circumstance that no plain answer was given was not a reason for complaining of the conduct of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The other line adopted in the course of the debate was this: Those who spoke for the Government pointed out to all our fellow-subjects across the seas the peculiar position in which England as a small island stood. They might well not have realised the extent to which our own situation was peculiar. It was pointed out with a wealth of illustration and statistics which no one could challenge. In these circumstances, he failed to understand how it could be suggested that there was any substance in the complaint that the suggestions put forward by the Colonial Premiers were not fully and adequately discussed. There was yet a further reason for supporting the Amendment, and it had been afforded by the line of argument of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for St. George's, Hanover Square. He claimed that tariff reformers had never put forward any suggestion which was going to interfere with the fiscal autonomy of the Colonies. The right hon. Gentleman surely could not have forgotten that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham at an earlier stage of the campaign proposed as an essential part of his scheme a schedule of prohibitive industries for the Colonies!

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.): I really have no right to interrupt the hon. Member, but perhaps he will permit me to say he is mistaken.

*MR. SIMON said that he of course readily recognised the right hon. Gentleman's right to interrupt. It was a matter on which he could claim to speak with authority. He (the speaker) did not want the House to think that he suggested that it might be found in the published works of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, but he certainly suggested that the proposal was reported in *The Times* on the day following the Glasgow speech.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I think I know the passage to which the hon. Member is alluding, and which was omitted from the published copy of the speeches just because it had given rise to misapprehension which my right hon. friend had not foreseen, and which he took the earliest opportunity of correcting.

*MR. SIMON said he would very gladly say no more about it. There was another proposition put forward by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for St. George's, Hanover Square, which struck him as peculiar. The right hon. Gentleman said that if they had to go through the disagreeable course of getting a tax from A, why should they decline to get it by a method which was going to do a little good to B and C. There was another right hon. Gentleman on the same Bench who once wrote an elementary primer on economics, and, if he might say so, the answer was to be found in that or any other elementary book on the subject. The first object of a tax should be the Imperial Treasury, and, since there had been no method invented by which, if they extracted money from A, they could both pay it into the Treasury and to B and C, the reason why it was not thought to be wise to use it for B and C was because it was essential that the tax should go to the Exchequer.

MR. LYTTELTON: The hon. Member does not understand my argument. My argument was first to tax for revenue. Having taxed for revenue, some other object may be served. It may be beneficial to some other person. The tax is not to be declared bad merely because it has an ancillary effect in benefiting someone else. That, I think, is a solid argument, and I do not think anybody sitting on this Bench has denied it.

*MR. SIMON said that that was not an ancillary effect; it was an alternative effect. The tax might either benefit certain persons or the Treasury. It could not benefit the Treasury and as an ancillary effect benefit B and C. He begged the pardon of the House for mentioning anything so extremely elementary. Hon. Gentlemen opposite accused free traders of being pedants. He submitted that the real pedantry consisted in failing to see how the situation of this country differed fundamentally from the situation of any other country, and that they were dealing with a small island which depended for its existence on an immense supply of food and raw material from abroad. They were dealing with a different world from the protectionist countries to which other arguments might apply. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for St. George's, Hanover Square, was driven to the alternative: "Shall we give a preference on raw materials or shall we give a preference on food?" He looked at raw materials and said it would be contrary to the universal canon to tax them. Food was the only alternative he had left. He had to tax that, but the right hon. Gentleman used an argument which would be equally good as an argument for taxing raw materials. His argument was that food could come from many places, and he asked who knew but that the effect of a preferential duty might be to promote the production of food in other and more favoured places. Why then should they hold up their hands in horror at the idea of taxing raw materials? They came from many places too. Let them take the common Australian sheep. There was meat inside him and wool outside him. It was supposed that if a preference were given there would be an encouragement to the productivity of Australian mutton. Would it not also do something to promote the productivity of Australian wool? If there was any force in this argument advanced to justify the somewhat timorous proposal to put a small tax on food, which the right hon. Gentleman hoped, if he caught him rightly, would make food cheaper, he failed to understand why it did not apply with the same force to the taxation of raw materials. The taxation of raw materials would be met with an outcry no doubt from many great and powerful industries in this country. The taxation of food would also be met with an outcry, but not perhaps from people so great and powerful. The position they took up was that, after all, food was the greatest of raw materials, and the moment the proposition was conceded that the taxation of raw materials was impossible the whole scheme of preference fell to the ground and the taxation of food was inferentially condemned. The right hon. Gentleman had not thrown any further light upon the way in which Colonial preference was to be afforded. How was it to be afforded to Canada? No doubt Canada was an old adherent to the view of preference, but how did anyone suggest that preference was going to be secured for either Canada or Australia or the South African Colonies? The Chancellor of the Exchequer again and again invited the Colonial Premiers to say what were to be the objects of Colonial preference, and no answer was forthcoming. He ventured to put the same question to hon. Gentlemen opposite—what were the objects in respect of which, according to them, Colonial preference should be applied? The right hon. Gentleman the Member for St. George's had not given weight to the essential distinction which existed between the offer of the Colonies, and what it was suggested this country could do for the Colonies. In the Colonies where protective tariffs already existed, a re-arrangement was no doubt possible. In this country, where no such tariffs existed, the only way of offering a favour to the Colonies was by withdrawing it from the rest of the world. For that another word was required. It was not preference that was wanted from the Mother Country, because the only form which that so-called preference could take was a new imposition on others as distinguished from the lightening of any existing burdens on the Colonies themselves. That distinction lay at the heart and root of the subject they were discussing, and he therefore begged to second the Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Resolution—

"In line 1, to leave out all after the word 'that,' and add the words 'in the opinion of this House, the permanent unity of the British Empire will not be secured through a system of preferential duties based upon the protective taxation of food.'"—(*Mr. Soares.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*LORD RONALDSHAY (Middlesex, Hornsey) thought he owed some explanation to the House in seeking to intervene in a maiden speech in the course of so interesting a debate as that which was before them. He did so because the question of preferential trading with our Colonies was one to which the electors, or at all events a very considerable majority of the electors whom he had the honour to represent attached paramount importance. It was upon that question and above all other questions that he invited some

22,000 electors to give their verdict a short time since, and although he gave the utmost publicity to it and put it in the forefront, both in his election address and in his speeches on public platforms, no gentleman ventured to come forward to contest the views he expressed and he was returned to Parliament *nemine contradicente* upon that issue. He felt, therefore, that he should not be dealing fairly with, or looking after the interest of, his electors were he not on their behalf to register some protest in the House in regard to the attitude which had been assumed by His Majesty's Government upon the subject at the recent Colonial Conference. He did not desire to dwell at any length upon the methods of procedure which were adopted at that Conference and the unfortunate secrecy with which the proceedings were enveloped at the time, but he did venture to protest against the insinuation which was made in the speech of the Under-Secretary for the Colonies at Edinburgh—a speech which had the supreme merit of displeasing his own supporters only a whit less than it disgusted his opponents—the insinuation that the representatives of our great Colonies had as the guests of the Government violated the laws of hospitality by addressing their views on this question to the people of this country. He could only suppose that the phrase then used, was one of those "terminological inexactitudes" with which Members of the House had become familiar. He was under the impression that the Colonial representatives were not the guests of the Government but the guests of the nation, and, agreeing as he did with the right hon. Gentleman, that the laws of hospitality did impose obligations upon the guest as well as upon the host, he thought it was the first duty of our guests, the Colonial Premiers, to put before the nation what was in their minds on this question. But he passed from that to that which was the fundamental issue between hon. Members on that side and hon. Members opposite, and that was the *non possumus* attitude which the Government had assumed towards the representations of the Colonial Premiers. Many interesting admissions were made in the Blue-book, and the chief objections which seemed to be made to listening to any scheme of colonial preference were, first, that the Government of the day had a mandate from the people against such a policy; in the second place, that no such policy could be carried out without taxing the food of the people; while, thirdly and lastly, it was said, and this was not the least important, that by adopting any such system we should be converting a cheap country into a dear country and controverting the fundamental principles and rules of our free trade policy. He noticed that the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his speech at the Colonial Conference declared that we were 43,000,000 of people and that the general election showed that we were convinced that no system of preference could be brought forward which did not mean the curtailment of the supply of the necessities of life and of the raw material necessary for the industries of this country. It was perfectly true that at the last general election the Government were returned to power by a large majority, but even if that election had been fought upon the straight issue of preferential treatment of our Colonies, which it was not, it was hardly correct to say that we were 43,000,000 of people who were not content to accept a policy of that kind. The right hon. Gentleman must be aware that although something over 3,000,000 votes were recorded for the present Government, at the same time a total of nearly 2,500,000 votes was recorded for the Party who were in favour of colonial preference and who placed this subject in the forefront of their programme. In this estimate he was giving the Party opposite what he was not sure they were entitled to, and that was all the various sections of the Liberal Party — Labour, Nationalists, Socialists, and Independent. But he would like to ask whether anyone could say that the last election was fought upon this one straight issue. He was sure that anyone who went through the political orgie of the last election must have been aware of the vast variety of issues which were brought to bear upon the electors. Why did hon. Members in all parts of the country masquerade as the custodians of the morals of their fellow countrymen in South Africa? Was it to be denied that their pamphlets and pictorial repreesntations on the subject of Chinese labour were intended to influence and did influence the opinions of their fellow countrymen at the last general election? Could they deny that their manœuvre to engineer a corner in consciences in regard to the education controversy did not have a serious effect upon the controversy? Further, he would point out that since the general election and since this issue had become distinguishable from the bewildering medley of political cross currents which prevailed at that time, the votes of the electorate had been given in a very different direction from that in which they were given then. Since the question of colonial preference had been put fairly and squarely before the country at by-elections, 101,000 votes had been recorded for it and only 93,000 against. As to preference itself he did not think right hon. Gentlemen would dispute the fact that very considerable advantages would accrue to this country in consequence of the increased trade which would take place with the Colonies. As the President of the Board of Trade pointed out, the Canadian preferential tariff had produced a very marked effect upon our trade with Canada. The right hon. Gentleman further admitted that—

> "Any reasonable and workable plan that would tend to increase the proportion of the produce which is bought by us from the Colonies, and by the Colonies from us and from each other, must necessarily enhance the resources of the Empire as a whole. A considerable part of the surplus population of the United Kingdom which now goes to foreign lands in search of a livelihood might then find it to its profit to pitch its tents somewhere under the flag, and the Empire would gain in riches of material and of men. We agree with our Colonial comrades, that all this is worth concerted effort, even if that effort at the outset costs us something. The federation of free commonwealths is worth making some sacrifice for."

When he read those words he asked himself whether the wisdom of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham had descended on the right hon. Member for Carnarvon, and when he called to mind the speeches of the same right hon. Gentleman, when he recalled the lurid pictures drawn by the right hon. Gentleman for the benefit of the workmen of this country of a prospect of German sausage and black bread, of cat's meat and dog's meat as a result of the policy proposed by the Motion before the House, he again asked himself was Saul among the prophets? The right hon. Gentleman went on to emphasise the fact that the Government

Lord Ronaldshay.

were prepared to make greater sacrifices in the future, but said that to tax the food of the people was to put the larger portion of the sacrifice on the poorest in the country. That was the same argument that had been adduced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer a little earlier in the debate. He did not know whether either or both of those gentlemen were members of that organised hypocrisy the Free Food League, but he was quite certain that whatever pious opinions the right hon. Gentlemen might hold as to the enormity of taxing the food of the people they found very little difficulty in violating them in practice, as the recent debates on the Finance Bill showed. One argument used during the Conference to the Colonial Premiers was—

> "You are asking us to do what no protectionist country in the world would think of doing; you are asking us to tax necessaries of either life or livelihood which we cannot produce ourselves, and of which you cannot, for many a long year, supply us with a sufficiency."

But surely the boot was on the other leg. He was under the impression that at the present time we were taxing tea, currants, sugar, and other commodities that we were not producing in this country, and it seemed to him absurd to inveigh against the Colonies for asking us to do what the requirements of our present fiscal system obliged us to do at the present time. The cry of taxing the food of the people was one which did not stand the test of analysis or of cold, impartial and unimpassioned investigation The 1s. registration duty on corn in this country had no result unless it was to cheapen the price of bread. Hon. and right hon. Gentlemen also showed a tendency to ignore the fact that the duties proposed with a view to giving a preference to our Colonies were not upon all, but only upon foreign corn. And they also ignored the fact that the imposition of such a tax would so stimulate the industry in the Colonies affected that the corn-producing area would be increased by some 15,000,000 or 20,000,000 acres and give employment to thousands of British men. He remembered two speeches made by one right hon. Gentleman in one afternoon to two different types of audiences. In one it was pointed out to the working man that a preference to our Colonies would mean a steadily increasing price on their food, and in the other, which was addressed to an agricultural audience, that agriculture in this county could not look for any profit from such a proposal as that of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham, because the imposition of such duties would stimulate the production in the Colonies concerned, and that the production would inevitably increase as time went on. The latter argument was the true one, and the Party cry of cheap food must be stigmatised as an untrue cry. It was an insincere and inaccurate statement to make to say that the cost of the food of the people would be raised by these proposals. Even if it were not inaccurate he would ask whether cheapness was everything in this world? He was bound to admit from a considerable experience of other countries that the conclusion he had come to was that the cheaper the cost of living the lower was the standard of living of the vast majority of the population of the country. He was sure that the example he was going to put to the House would be appreciated by hon. Members opposite. He would refer to a country with regard to which hon. Members opposite showed such a profound and intimate knowledge, China. That country, besides having the privilege of supplying what were called slaves for the benefit of this country, also had the advantage of a fiscal system similar to that which we enjoyed at the present time. So great was the cheapness of living in the country that every necessary of life could be enjoyed by a man with an annual income of £3. But what was the condition of the working and labouring classes of this region of all-round prosperity? He would quote a short sentence from one who had lived in the country for the greater part of his life, the Rev. Dr. Smith, an American gentleman who described the lot of the labourer as that of a man "who is driven by the constant and chronic reappearance of the wolf at his door to spend his life in an everlasting grind." He ventured therefore to submit that cheapness was not everything in this life. In the interior of China the cheapest means of conveyance was by wheelbarrow, and a man could travel by wheelbarrow at four-fifths of a farthing per mile. It might be considered an advantage by hon. Gentlemen opposite to travel at that rate, but would hon. Members representing labour in that House consider that it was a proper condition of life if they had to wheel hon. and right hon. Gentlemen at that rate of remuneration? A manifesto was issued not long ago by hon. Members sitting below the gangway. To what was it that they owed the conditions, so flourishing, of labour in this country at the present time? Was it not to this horrid word protection? There they had it in its most severe form, the protection of trade unionism, which was described by Cobden, the founder of the political belief to which they subscribed, as "founded on principles of brutal tyranny and monopoly." It had been argued by hon. Members that if we were to contract commercial treaties with our Colonies and dependencies the inevitable result would be to bring down retaliatory measures from foreign countries. In that respect hon. Members opposite showed unnecessary timidity, and were making themselves miserable in anticipation of evils not likely to occur. Retaliation was not always followed by undesirable results. Russia had retaliated upon India by putting a countervailing duty upon Indian tea in consequence of our action in joining the Sugar Convention, but the retaliation, far from being a hindrance to India, had apparently been of great service to her. During the last four years, export of tea from India to Russia had increased from 1,500,000 pounds to 10,000,000 pounds at the present time. He came to the last question, that of flying in the face of fundamental rules and principles of our free-trade system. Why should they hesitate from flying in the face of those principles if, by so doing, they gained material advantages? Because a small tax might have some advantage to producers in this country, why should they be prevented from levying it and so bringing about those advantages which they had so nearly at heart? He knew very well that there were many among their opponents who said that such a policy was nothing more nor less than protection in disguise. He had heard the statement quoted from Lord Beaconsfield that protection in this country was not only dead but damned. But that appeared to him to be entirely beside the point at issue.

Why did they not also quote the remark of Lord Beaconsfield, which was very relevant to the question they had now under consideration, namely, that if they looked to the history of this country since the advent of Liberalism it would be seen that the efforts of Liberals had been in the direction of the disintegration of the Empire? why should they refrain from quoting from the same statesman another speech as to the self-governing Colonies? Lord Beaconsfield declared that self-government, in his opinion, ought to have been ceded as part of a great policy of Imperial consolidation, that it ought to have been accompanied by an Imperial tariff and by the institution of some representative council in this country. That appeared to him to be entirely relevant to the question which they had before them. He entered his protest on behalf of those whom he represented against the attitude adopted by His Majesty's Government at the Colonial Conference, and he supported most heartily the Motion which had been made by his right hon. friend.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): The House will consider that it is now time that some statement should be made from the Treasury Bench as to the position which we occupy this afternoon; and the first observation I would venture to address to the House is that we are engaged in discussing a vote of censure. A vote of censure is a very serious thing. When it is moved with due formality on behalf of the official Opposition, it is intended always to raise a plain and decisive issue. I must, however, observe that of all the votes of censure which have been proposed in recent times in this House, the one we are now discussing is surely the most curious. The last Government was broken up three years ago on this very question of Imperial preference. After the Government had been broken up, a continuous debate proceeded in the country for two years and a half, and it was terminated by the general election. This Parliament is the result of that election, and there is not a single Gentleman on this Ministerial Bench who is not pledged in the most specific terms, not to grant a preferential tariff to the Colonies. Now, because we have kept that promise, because being opposed to preferential tariffs we have declined to grant preferential tariffs, because we have done what all along we declared we were going to do, and were returned to do, we are made the object of this vote of censure. It may be said, "We do not blame you for keeping your promise, but for making it." But what did the Leader of the Opposition promise? He promised most emphatically before the election that if he were in power as Prime Minister when this Colonial Conference took place, he would not grant preference to the Colonies. On many occasions the right hon. Gentleman said that not one, but two elections would be necessary before he would be entitled to take that tremendous step.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR was understood to dissent.

MR. CHURCHILL: I have the right hon. Gentleman's words here. Speaking at Manchester in January, 1905, the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "If that scheme were carried out, I do not see that we could be called on to decide the colonial aspect of this question until not only one, but two elections have passed."

Yet the right hon. Gentleman is prepared I presume to join in a vote of censure on His Majesty's Government for not granting that preference which he himself was prohibited from granting by the most precise and particular engagement. Is it indeed a vote of censure on the Government at all? Is it not really a vote of censure on the general election? Is it not a cry of petulant vexation at the natural, orderly, long-expected sequence of events? To such a vote of censure, however proposed, and with whatever arguments it may be supported, an Amendment has been moved by my hon. friend who sits for the Barnstaple Division. I know something of the Amendment because in the late Parliament it was a Motion which I myself drafted in the days when we earnestly desired to procure a plain issue; and the Amendment which is now proposed is designed for that end and that end alone, to procure a plain and decided issue in order to know, after the vote has been taken, exactly where every one stands. I have no idea what course hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite propose to take. The last time such a proposition was put before the House they met it with the previous question, and they carried that because they could not carry a direct negative. They found that in the late Parliament, that stern Parliament, elected on the impulse of the Khaki election, even with all the influence of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, they were not able to meet the proposition which the hon. Gentleman is moving this afternoon, by a direct negative. The late Parliament shrank from its duty of pronouncing clearly and plainly to the country. Well, the question has come up again, not entirely owing to action on our part, but owing to the course which the right hon. Gentleman and his friends have seen fit to take; and I am inclined to think that the present House to-night will adopt a policy different from that which was adopted in the last Parliament, and will emphatically put on record its opinion on this most grave and great Imperial and social question. The right hon. Gentleman who moved the Resolution made a very mild and conciliatory speech. But he confined himself to generalities. He avoided anything like a statement of concrete proposals which he thinks the Government ought to adopt. Those who take part in this controversy nowadays avoid any statement of the concrete proposals that would follow if their view were adopted. We are told what a splendid thing preference is, what noble results it would achieve, what inexpressible happiness and joy it would bring in all parts of the Empire and in all parts of the earth, what wealth would be created, how the Exchequer would gain, and how the food of the people would cheapen in price. But, though the Government is blamed for not acting on these suggestions, we are never told what is the schedule of taxes which it is proposed to introduce to give effect to these splendid and glittering aspirations. It is perfectly impossible to discuss colonial preference apart from the schedule of duties on which it is to be based. It is idle to attempt to discuss it without a definite proposal as to the subjects of taxation and as to the degree to which those different subjects are to be taxed. And the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, who has studied this question, felt that in common fairness he must be precise and definite. We know what he proposed in the way of taxation on corn, meat, fruit, and dairy produce. What we want to know is this. Is that tariff before us now? I want to know, is it for not according such a preference to the Colonies that the Government are to be censured? Is it the view of those who support the Motion that the Government would have done right to impose the duties proposed by the right hon. Member for West Birmingham at Glasgow in 1903? Do the Opposition stand by the right hon. Member for West Birmingham, or do they abandon him? That is what the House and the Government want to know—what we are going to know if we can—and that is what the Colonies want to know. What will the protectionists in the Colonies say if they find to-morrow that the programme of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham has been abandoned? It is indispensable to the discussion of this question that there should be a clear statement from the Leader of the Opposition whether or not we are to regard the Glasgow preferential tariff of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham as being still in operation or out of operation. Not only is it clear, however, that this tariff is still the proposal of the Party opposite, but no other policy can be framed on which a uniform, symmetrical, or fair preference can be accorded to the Colonies. But, even if the House looks at the alternative propositions put forward, the issue which it has now to decide is not less clear. The House has been told that the Government might have given a preference on dutiable articles. There are two objections which will occur to everyone as to that proposal. In the first place, such a preference operating over an area of £36,000,000 of revenue involves a considerable surrender of revenue. An obligation is laid on any Member, or on any Party who proposes a reduction of revenue either to show a method which will render that economy unnecessary or to propose an alternative fiscal instrument. Has the Opposition such a fiscal instrument? How is it proposed to fill the gap which will be created if we accord preference to the Colonies on tea, sugar, tobacco, and wine? Is it proposed to put a tax on corn, or on manufactured articles, or on meat and dairy produce? If so, let it be said, because I am certain that the proposals which would be made from the Opposition benches to meet this deficiency in the revenue will infallibly raise the old controversy raised by the right hon. Member for West Birmingham in the last Parliament. The second objection is that it introduces in our fiscal system an entirely new, and, as the Government think, the wholly vicious feature of discriminating between one class of producers and another. The whole basis of our financial and fiscal policy—a policy which has been pursued for so many years by this country and which has been supported by the practice and the precepts of so many great and distinguished men—is that it draws no distinction whatever between different classes of producers, whether they reside here or abroad, whether they live in foreign countries or in our Colonies. I am quite prepared to state that proposition in its simplest and if necessary most unpopular form. That is the fundamental principle of our fiscal system, there is no discrimination. We have but one measure to give to those who trade with us—the just measure of equality, and there can be no better measure than that. That is the fundamental principle of the free-trade position, and if it is challenged, as it is by the Party opposite, the whole of the great controversy is again raised between free trade and tariff reform. I do not believe that the Opposition will be acting with candour if they say they have abandoned the proposals which the right hon. Member for West Birmingham has made. I believe that those proposals are still their policy, and any lesser proposal put forward is only designed to lead up to them. But even if we confine ourselves exclusively to the proposal to accord preference on dutiable articles, that in itself raises the whole issue.

Now, let me meet another charge. I think it was suggested in the speech we heard from the right hon. Gentleman opposite and the noble Lord whose able speech we have just listened to that the Government have been guilty of pedantry in dealing with the Colonial Conference, through not making some concession as to dutiable articles. The Colonial representatives, when they asked for a preference on wine and tobacco, did not ask for it because it was of value to them in itself. They knew well that the operation of such a preference must be unfair and unequal. They knew well that Canada, who has the most solid claims upon us for a preferential recognition, would receive no benefit from such a preference on wine. But the Colonial representatives of South Africa asked for a preference on wine and tobacco in order that, as they avowed with candour, we should concede the principle. That is a perfectly proper proceeding on their part; it is the natural way of advancing the views which they hold, because it would lead up to the general principle and the larger policy. But the Government are opposed in this case to "the larger policy." The Government sit now on these Benches because they are opposed to it as a Government and as a Party. It is one of the fundamental conditions of our existence that we are opposed to such a policy. How, then, by any process of argument, can the Government be censured for not making an exception which must inevitably have led to the breaking of the great rule to which the Government are pledged? It is a very dangerous thing in this controversy, with the ugly rush of vested interests always lying in the wake of the Protectionist movement to be considered, to make even verbal concessions. Some time ago I made a speech in which I said that there was no objection to the extension of inter-colonial preference. By this I meant the reduction of duties between countries which have already a discriminating tariff; and it seemed to me in such a case that there is a net reduction of duty which is all to the good. I do not see any objection to that, because it seems to me that under the most-favoured-nation principle we gain any advantage that is gained by the other parties to the transaction. In any case the sums involved in inter-colonial preference at the present time are extremely small, and however this may be the matter is one which is wholly outside our control, because we have no authority over the Colonies whatever in fiscal matters, so that we may just as well look pleasant about it. Yes, but when such a statement is made by a Minister, is it accepted as evidence of a desire on the part of the Government to extend sympathetic treatment to the Colonies? Not at all. It is taken as an admission, and used for the purpose of trying to pretend that the Government have abandoned the principle of their opposition to the larger question of Imperial preference. We are told forthwith that we have given up every logical foothold against preference, and that nothing prevents us imposing a tax on bread and meat except our inability to follow the drift of our own arguments. There is another charge—an atrocious charge—which has been made against us. We are told that we have been ungrateful to the Colonies, that the Colonial representatives came over here offering us great things, and that we have met their offers with nothing at all. My hon. friend the Member for Barnstaple reminded the House that if a balance had to be cast between the services reciprocally rendered by the Colonies and the Mother Country there could be no doubt whatever on which side the balance of advantage would lie. I do not wish to dwell upon that. We avoid making our case in all its strength because we desire to see the British Empire woven together on the principle of a family, with no sharp division of profit and loss in the calculation. When, however, we are reproached with treating the Colonies with ingratitude, I say that those who have to defend the free-trade policy of the country are forced to look narrowly into the profit and loss relationship between the Colonies and the Mother Country. What were the proposals put before us and the Colonial Conference? I have referred to preference, but there was another proposal. I am sorry the right hon. Gentleman the Member for St. George's, Hanover Square, is not in his place at the moment. He put forward a proposal earlier in the year, and it was renewed in a slightly different form by Mr. Deakin at the Conference. The proposal was to impose a 1 per cent. *ad valorem* surtax on all foreign merchandise coming into the ports of the British Empire. That was a proposal which the right hon. Gentleman put forward as the least objectionable form of the preferential proposals, and he said of it that it was the least objectionable because it gave no loophole for the corruption which he evidently thinks will spring up in the wake of the other proposals made by hon. Members on the Benches opposite. Let me ask the House to examine this proposal for a moment. Has any serious civilised Government—I ask for information—ever been to the pains and trouble of erecting round their coasts a tariff with all its complications, with all the need of exacting certificates of origin on every class of goods, with all the need of demanding strict assessment of all commodities brought to their shores—has any nation ever erected such a vast and complicated network as would be involved in such a duty simply for the paltry purpose of imposing a duty of 1 per cent.? I say there is no argument and no reason for such a course, and the only argument which could justify it is the argument used by Dr. Smartt at the Colonial Conference when he said (page 514 of the Blue-book)—

> "The foreigner pays, and we do not."

Mr. Deakin felt the force of the objection which would be entertained in this country to introducing such a tariff as the right hon. Gentleman has proposed, simply for purposes of a 1 per cent. duty, and he proceeded to say that Great Britain, if she was a party to such a bargain, should be permitted to raise the money in her own way, and to contribute her proportion to the common fund. That was a great concession to the self-government of the Mother Country. I would like to say to the House that there is a great difference, to my mind, between subventions and preferences—a subvention may, at any rate, be raised by a perfectly orthodox fiscal process. No more money is taken from the taxpayer than is required. The whole yield of the tax by which the subvention may be raised can certainly go to the Exchequer, and when the subvention is paid to the Colonial Government it does not go, as a preference would go, to benefit particular interests in the Colony, but it goes to the Government of the Colony for the general purposes of State, and not for private advantage at any point. Therefore on the face of it, I say that the method of subvention is very much to be preferred to the method of preference. But it would be necessary in examining a question of subvention to look at it on its merits. We have this year given a subvention to Jamaica of £200,000 on its merits, because of the disaster and confusion into which Jamaica has been plunged by the earthquake. And there is a proposal of which we have heard and which is being examined on its merits by His Majesty's Government for improving sea communication to and fro across the Atlantic. That may be a foolish proposal or it may not, but each particular question has to be looked at upon its merits. It is upon the merits, and not upon the principle, that criticism would naturally be directed. This proposal of 1 per cent. put forward by Mr. Deakin carried the support of the official spokesman of the Opposition. Let us examine that on its merits. Look at the proportions on which this new fund was to be subscribed. Canada was to dedicate—that was the expression used by Mr. Deakin — £400,000, New Zealand £20,000, Newfoundland £6,000, Cape Colony £40,000, Natal £26,000, Great Britain £4,500,000, and Australia—the proposing body—what was she to dedicate to this fund? No less than £100,000 a year, or one forty-fifth part of the contribution which was to be made by this country. And for what object was this fund to be accumulated? It is hard enough for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to raise the money to carry on so great an establishment as this country is forced necessarily to maintain. But here is a proposal to raise no less than £4,500,000 of extra taxation, for what objects? For objects not specified, for objects not yet discovered, for objects which could not be stated by those who made the proposal. The right hon. Gentleman said that there was to be a meeting of the representatives of the different Colonies in the different great cities of the Empire—one different great city each year for seven years, excluding London, where there was to be no meeting, and they were to search for a method of spending this money. The House will see that the real essential fallacy of the protectionist proposal is the idea that taxation is a good thing in itself, that it should be imposed for the fun of the thing, and then, having done it for amusement, we should go round afterwards and look for attractive methods of expenditure in order to win support to the project. These are the actual proposals made to us at the Colonial Conference. These are the sort of proposals in respect of which we are to be censured, forsooth, because we have not found it possible in the name of the Government of this country to give our assent to them.

These matters are very clearly understood in Australia. I have here a great number of cuttings from Australian newspapers. I am not going to read them to the House, because that would take too long, but I trust if they are published in the newspapers of this country, hon. Gentlemen who take part in these debates may find some opportunity of casting their eyes over them. There are a great many newspapers in Australia which thoroughly understand our position on this question, and thoroughly share the views His Majesty's Government have put forward. We do not hear always the views which are put forward by many of the most important journals under the Southern Cross, but when anything is said in detriment of the Government it is telegraphed swiftly back, and it appears in all the powerful papers of the Party opposite. But every Party in this House has its friends in the Colonies. Every opinion in this House has supporters and champions in the Colonies. Liberals and Labour men will find for their views the ready and sympathetic understanding in the Colonies which I say creates in all our hearts the warmest feelings towards those dominions where there is such shrewd and active public opinion, and where all questions are debated with fair representation of both sides.

I venture to review the economic argument as it strikes me. I do not want to go into the difficult question of the incidence of taxation in any detail, but I venture to submit a proposition to the House as a broad general rule. I daresay the right hon. Gentleman may rout up some hard case in conflict with it, but as a broad general rule I believe it will be found true to say that there is no power in a Government to impose taxation outside the limits of its territorial sovereignty. Although I am quite ready to admit that by sudden and unexpected alterations of the tariff temporary advantage might be gained, and some share of the wealth of other people and other countries might be netted for this or that set of traders within your own border, in the long run the whole yield of any tax, export or import, will come home to the people of that country by whom it is imposed. It will come home plus the whole cost of collecting the tax, and plus further the inconvenience and burden of the network of taxation which is needed. It will come home to them, if they be consumers, in the quantity, quality, or price of the articles they consume, and, if exporters, in the profit, convenience, or reserve power of the business which they conduct. If that general rule be in the main a not untrue guide in matters of taxation, it is evident that preference means, in name as well as in fact, better prices. It can mean nothing else than better prices. If it does not mean better prices, it is a sham and a fraud. How are you going to call into being these new corn lands, or how is to be supposed that the tobacco culture and the export of Cape and Australian wines will be stimulated except through the agency of price? The operation is the simplest in the world. By an artificial tariff arrangement particular branches of industry are made more profitable to those engaged in them. They are able to secure a larger price for the goods they sell, and consequently there is a stimulus to engage in such a trade. That is the whole operation of preference. It can only operate through price, and it can, in our case, only operate through food prices. There is no parity between the sacrifices demanded of the Mother Country and the proposals of preference made by the various Colonies. To them it is merely a fresh application of their existing fiscal system. To us it is a fiscal revolution. To them it is a mere re-writing of their schedules to give an increased measure of protection to their home producer. To us it is a tax on the food, and, as I assert again and again, upon raw material, of the people and the industries of these islands. If the Conference has established one thing clearly it is this, that none of the great self-governing Colonies of the British Empire are prepared to give us effective access to their own markets in competition with their home producers. That was established with absolute clearness, and even if they were prepared to give us effective access to their home markets, I submit to the House that, having regard to the great preponderance of our foreign trade as against our Colonial trade, it would not be worth our while to purchase the concession which they would then offer at the cost of disturbing and dislocating the whole area of our world-wide trade. Therefore, we propose to adhere, and are prepared if necessary to be censured for adhering, to our general financial system, which is based and governed by the rule that there should be no taxation except for revenue, and based on the commercial principle of the equal treatment of all nations, and the most-favoured-nation treatment from those nations in return.

Important as are the economical arguments against a preferential policy, they are in my opinion less grave than the political disadvantages. On other occasions I have addressed the House on the grave danger and detriment to the working of our Colonial system which must follow the intermingling of the affairs of the British Empire in the party politics and financial politics of this country. It is very evident upon the face of it that there is no better way of producing an anti-Colonial Party than to associate the relations which we have with the Colonies with many subjects of taxation, and by so doing we should have forced upon the House year after year that very profit and loss calculation which we deprecate, and which, with great restraint, we have on the whole refrained from making in any very harsh form. There is indeed a threefold peril. There are the irremovable food taxes fixed by treaty with Governments scattered all over the world which preference necessitates. There are the fluctuations of price which occur in every commodity subject to climatic conditions. Both these factors must be taken in conjunction with the immense swaying electorate upon which political institutions and the fortunes of political parties in this country rest. There has been a recent small rise in the price of wheat—not a very large rise, but a sensible rise—which has caused suffering not less acute, because the cause cannot always accurately be traced, in many humble homes in this country. What a lucky thing it is that we, or hon. Gentlemen opposite, who are so skilled in these matters, have not got to go about the country explaining that that rise in wheat is due in any measure to the imposition of a tax for the benefit of the Colonies! To establish a preferential system with the Colonies involving differential duties upon food is to make the bond of Imperial unity dependent from year to year upon the weather and the crops. And there is even a more unstable foundation of Imperial unity. Does it never occur to right hon. Gentlemen opposite that this solution which they propose of the problem of Imperial unity places the Empire not on a national but on a purely party basis? Some day it may be that they will return triumphant from a general election. As party politicians they may rejoice, yet I think a wise statesman would try to win for the British Empire and its Colonial relations the same sort of position, high above the struggle of parties, which is now so happily occupied by the Crown and the Courts of Justice, which in less degree, though in an increasing degree, is coming to be occupied by the Services and by the affairs of India. I venture to think that whatever advantages from a Party point of view may be gained, or whatever advantages from the point of view of gratifying Colonial opinion may be gained by food preferences, they would be very small compared with the enormous boon of excluding from the field of Colonial politics the great fundamental social and economic issues on which Parties in this country are so fiercely divided. Think well before you build the British Empire upon a basis repudiated by half the nation. It is possible to take a wider view yet of this question. I will quote the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, and let me assure the House that I do not do it for the purpose of making any petty charge of inconsistency, but because the words which I am going to read are wise and true words, and stand the test of time. When the right hon. Gentleman spoke at Manchester in 1897, not in the distant days before the great Home Rule split, but when he was already a Minister in the Unionist Government, and had been Secretary of State for the Colonies for nearly two years, he used these words which I venture to say represent the highest wisdom upon this question—

> "Anything in the direction of an Imperial Commercial League would weaken the Empire internally and excite the permanent hostility of the whole world. It would check the free imports of the food of the people. It is impracticable, but if it were practicable and done in the name of the Empire it would make the Empire odious to the working people, it would combine the whole world against us, and it would be a cause of irritation and menace. Our free commerce makes for the peace of the world."

And it is with these statesmanlike words in the minds of the House that I would urge hon. Gentlemen to join with us, to insist upon imparting year after year to the British Empire an inclusive and not an exclusive character. We who sit on this side of the House, who look forward perhaps to larger brotherhoods and more exact standards of social justice, we value and cherish the British Empire because in its large and generous tolerance it represents more than any other similar organisation has ever represented, the peaceful co-operation of all sorts of men in all sorts of countries. We think it is a model of what we hope the whole world will become, in days which we shall not see, but which are approaching, and to the happy advent of which we may sensibly and even powerfully contribute. The House has to-night a considerable opportunity. If in rejecting this vote of censure, so ill-conceived, so little deserved, we choose to adopt the Amendment of my hon. friend the Member for Barnstaple, we shall have written upon the records of Parliament a profound political truth which will not, I think, soon be challenged, and which I believe, will never be overthrown.

*Mr. CHAPLIN (Surrey, Wimbledon): It so happens that this is the first opportunity I have had of speaking to this House upon the question which is now before us. I hope therefore that hon. Members will grant me a little indulgence for a short time, and perhaps I may be permitted to begin by saying this. The right hon. Member who has just sat down complains of the Motion which has been moved by my right hon. friend because it is, he says, unreasonable to move a vote of censure on a Government who are simply carrying out the mandate of the country. Is it indeed, or was it indeed, the mandate of the country? The decision at the general election was taken about a vast variety of issues which were then before the country, and the statement of the right hon. Gentleman reminds me of a story told about myself during the Brigg election the other day. I know it is true, because it was told me by the Member for Brigg himself. One day during the election a small farmer friend of his came up to him and said, "Do you support Squire Chaplin's policy?" "What policy are you speaking of?" he said. He replied, "His fiscal policy." "Yes," said my hon. friend. "Ah well, then," the farmer said, "I cannot support you." "But why not?" "Oh," he said, "you know Mr. Chaplin passed the Vaccination Bill some few years ago, and we are told down here that if he carries his fiscal policy during the next session or the next Parliament, we shall all of us have to be vaccinated or re-vaccinated within a fortnight." That, I suspect, is not so bad a gauge of the mandate that you profess to have had, and as a good many hon. Gentlemen on that side of the House perhaps believe. It is absolutely true that the election was decided on a whole variety of issues, and if any part of it was decided, and if you had any mandate at all with regard to preference at that time, all I can say is that there has been a very considerable change of opinion since then, as is shown by a number of elections in all parts of the country. I turn if I may for a moment to the Amendment which has been moved by the hon. Member for the Barnstaple Division. The hon. Member and others besides him have declared over and over again, the hon. Member echoing almost the language of his own Amendment, that the security, the unity, of the Empire can never and will never be maintained or secured by a system of preference which is based on I think he called it the protective taxation of food. I admit at once that some very small duties have been proposed. The right hon. Member who has just sat down asked if we still adhered to the policy of the hon. Member for West Birmingham, and whether we were going to throw him over or not. The right hon. Gentleman need hardly have asked that question of the Unionist Party; he may be absolutely certain that whatever else may come the Unionist Party are not going to throw over, either now or any other time, that right hon. Gentleman, and we shall adhere to the main points of his policy, and before many years are over I believe we shall carry it into effect. The right hon. Member and his friends have maintained over and over again that the unity of the Empire can never be secured by the means that we propose, and I admit, as I said just now, that it is true that some very small duties have been proposed on food imported into this country, in order to enable us to give some preference and advantage to our Colonies and our own Possessions in our dealings with them over all foreign countries with whom we have dealings also. I have watched the progress of this movement pretty closely; I am aware, I think, of all the proceedings that have happened in connection with it, and I state to-night that I am aware of no single duty which has been proposed for that purpose of which it can be truly and justly said that it will be either protective in its effect or what is described in the Amendment and in the speech of the hon. Member as the taxation of food. I say taxation of food because I am one of those who, while differing with the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, agree entirely with one of the Colonial Prime Ministers, viz., Mr. Deakin, that a duty on food is not necessarily the taxation of food or felt by the consumer. Of course the chief of these duties is a duty on corn—a 2s. duty on corn coming from foreign countries, while corn from our own possessions is to continue to come in free. I frankly own that if I could have my way when the time comes, and come it will I hope sooner or later—sooner than hon. Gentlemen think—I should like to go a little further. In addition to the duty of 2s. on foreign corn, I should like to go back to the old 1s. duty on all corn for one reason and one reason alone, because of the great duty it will produce and which, if imposed to-morrow, would be very little short of £3,000,000. I am not at all certain that I should get my own way. There might be some opposition to that view. But many hon. Members would do well to remember that so fast and so rapid have been in late years the increased imports of Colonial corn into this country that at the present moment it represents practically half of the whole importation, But 2s. on the half is merely the equivalent of a 1s. duty on the whole. For nearly a year during 1903, and at an earlier period for twenty-five years, this tax was retained with the full sanction and approval of Mr. Gladstone and of other great free traders like him, and it will puzzle the most extreme supporter of the Cobden Club to show that it has ever at any time been protective in its effects. And still less can a duty on corn which has never raised the price of the loaf by a fraction of a farthing be said to be a tax on food. I am aware that the answers to this contention are mainly two, and one of them, and the least important, is this—it was raised by the hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment to-night, and I think also by the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down: "If your duties are not meant to raise prices, and if they will not have that effect, then the unfortunate farmer is going to be left out in the cold, and you are going to do nothing for him." But who on earth ever supposed that the farmer was ever to be put on his legs again and agriculture restored to its old position in the country by such duties as these? The idea is absurd to anyone knowing the subject. But what you can, and what I hope you will, do sooner or later is this; these duties, small as they are in the aggregate, will produce very considerable revenues indeed, and if you apply as you ought to apply the proceeds of these particular duties to the needs and necessities of agriculture, then I grant you that indirectly, but only in that way, these duties will bring a real and material advantage to the one great interest which needs it the most in the whole of the country. Beyond this I do not think even the most advanced tariff reformer has ever demanded or asked for anything more. On the contrary, there is a paragraph in the Report of the Commission, of which I was myself chairman, and which was signed by every member of that Commission, many of whom were farmers, to this effect—

> "Another proposal made in the evidence is that higher duties than those suggested by Mr. Chamberlain should be imposed. The evidence we have received is to the effect that no considerable extension of wheat growing can take place unless the price is at least 40s. per quarter, and to restore the growth of wheat to anything like its old proportions a rise in price to 50s. per quarter would probably be required. This would mean duties as high as, and in most cases higher than, those which prevail in the most highly protected foreign countries, and we do not think that the imposition of such high duties is either practicable or desirable in the United Kingdom."

The other answer I meet with is this, and it was used against the proposal of my right hon. friend the Member for St. George's, Hanover Square: "It is not a 1s. or 2s. duty we fear, but what it will lead to;" and nobody has really pressed this point more strongly than my right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade, who says that what they fear is not a 1s. or 2s. duty, but that it will never stop there. The right hon. Gentleman raised this question in a very emphatic form at page 379 of the Blue-book, from which I am going to quote. The right hon. Gentleman said—

> "First of all, I put the danger which undoubtedly we would incur from the temptation which has been found irresistible in France and Germany, the temptation to increase the duty. In France the duty started at 1s.; it is now 12s. In Germany it started at 2s. and it stood at 7s. 7d. in 1902, and has gone up, and I think it is now somewhere in the neighbourhood of 12s. If these powerful governments have been unable to resist the clamour for increased duties for the protection of agriculture, why should we be able to resist it?"

Why indeed? For the simplest and most conclusive reason in the world. Because the decision will rest with the voters of this country and the vast majority of those voters are firmly convinced that to have duties like these would be fatal and injurious to them and, what is more precious to them, to their little ones. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to think that there was some kind of analogy in this respect between Germany and France and ourselves in this country. But there the right hon. Gentleman is in error. It is directly to the interest of a very large majority of voters in France that these duties shall be maintained and especially in the country districts. Why? Because they are a race of peasants cultivating the land which they own themselves, and they are perhaps the most thrifty, most hard working, most industrious people in the world. Their whole object is to increase the profits on their little farms. Their prosperity depends very largely on these duties which the preponderance of their voting power enables them to maintain. But it is exactly the opposite in this country, where few of the voters have any land at all, and where their first consideration is that there shall always be a cheap and abundant supply of food, and which they have and always will have the power to command. The same thing holds good to a large degree in Germany, though not to so large an extent as in France; but Germany has another reason in addition. Germany has an enormous land frontier to defend, and if the great calamity, which God forbid, happened of a war between Germany and her neighbours, the first result would be that the food which is imported across her frontier would be stopped at once. For that reason it is a national and military necessity of the first importance that a sufficient supply of corn should always be grown at home. I think I have shown that there is not the slightest analogy between these two countries and ourselves in this respect, and that the whole of the alarm which is felt by the right hon. Gentleman is absolutely without the shadow of a probability of foundation. I have also said enough to prove that what the right hon. Member and others who support this Amendment have said that preference is inadmissible because it means the taxation of food is wholly unsupported by the fact. This delusion, however, I hope the expression will not be regarded as offensive, as no offence whatever is intended—is shared by many others besides the right hon. Gentleman among those who sit with him on the Front Bench opposite. But in spite of that, on reading the Blue-book I read with the utmost satisfaction the passage quoted by my hon. friend this afternoon. Indeed I intended to have quoted it myself. When I read the generous opinions put before the Conference in the presence of the Prime Ministers of the Colonies by the right hon. Gentleman sitting opposite to me I rubbed my hands and said: "the truth is that these Gentlemen are beginning to realise the facts of the situation, they are beginning to realise the importance of securing the Canadian and other markets." But when I had read a little further all my hopes were disappointed. It all ended in what has been described by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition. The Colonial Ministers were disappointed and the hundreds of thousands of people in this country who support this policy were also bitterly disappointed. In supporting the policy they adhered to, I am bound to say the right hon. Gentleman and the Chancellor of the Exchequer did their very best to make it good by statements of a very remarkable character; statements which, if they had been true would really, I think, have given a good deal of support to the policy they proposed. In defence of their views and the attitude they took up at the Conference both the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the President of the Board of Trade made some remarkable statements as to the present position of our trade in foreign markets. On p. 310, the Chancellor of the Exchequer speaks as follows:

> "We stand better at this moment in the tariff protected markets of Europe than any of the nations which have protected themselves *inter se* by retaliation."

[Hear, hear.] Quite so, but that is not in accordance with some figures which I am going to quote, although I shall quote them with all the respect and deference that is becoming to the Minister in charge of the Board of Trade, and all the authority that office places upon him. On page 372 I find his colleague declaring in support of him that—

> "There is not a great market in the world in which we have not done more than hold our own in recent years."

If those statements were accurate they would do something to support the views of the two right hon. Gentlemen. But they are flatly contradicted by calculations based on the official returns of the United Kingdom and Germany respectively which have been supplied to me. I am going to ask the right hon. Gentlemen to give me their attention on this point, because I think it is a matter of considerable importance. These calculations show that in the last ten years the exports from the United Kingdom to the six protected countries, viz., France, Austria Hungary, Italy, Russia, Switzerland, and the United States have increased from £53,200,000 in the five years ending 1901 to £59,400,000 in the five years ending 1906, or by £6,200,000. In Germany, on the other hand, the exports show an increase to the same countries from £92,100,000 in the five years ending 1900 to £101,700,000 in the five years ending 1905—or by £9,600,000; so that with Germany, at all events, we have not by any means held our own, and her relative progress has been greatly larger than ours. What then is the excuse, what is the reason advanced by the right hon. Gentlemen for the attitude they took up at the Colonial Conference? The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer said—

> "We have come to the conclusion that the maintenance of Free Trade, in its fullest and widest sense, is not only expedient but absolutely vital to our economic interests. And that to listen to the appeal of the Colonies would be the abandonment of Free Trade as part of the bargain."

I do not follow the right hon. Gentleman. How can you abandon or maintain something that you have not got, and which you have never had since the present fiscal policy was adopted by this country. We have not got and we never have had free trade or anything approaching to it since our present fiscal system was first adopted by the country. And if the right hon. Gentleman disputes this I challenge him now across the Table to name to me across the floor of this House one single considerable foreign country with whom trade is free to-day. Can he name one? No, he cannot. The right hon. Gentleman is silent, he cannot name a single country where our trade is free to-day.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): I will reply to the right hon. Gentleman later on.

MR. CHAPLIN: Yes, but will you name one? No, the right hon. Gentleman will not reply now because he knows there is no considerable foreign country in the markets of which our trade is free to-day, and he knows that the statement I have made is unanswerable, because it is absolutely true. I pass on from that. What we have got in this country and what has done duty all these years for free trade and what does duty for it now to the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade is nothing whatever but a system under which, although it is perfectly true that our markets are free and open to the whole of the world, every considerable foreign market that can be named is either partially or wholly closed to us by hostile and sometimes absolutely prohibitive tariffs. That is what the right hon. Gentleman insists upon putting before the country as trade which is free under our present system of free trade. Let the right hon. Gentleman ask British manufacturers who seek to sell their goods within the borders of the foreign countries of the world what the result is. There are many manufacturers in this House who will bear me out when I tell the right hon. Gentleman that the treatment which is meted out to them is this: They are told, "You can sell of course in our markets if you please, but before you begin to sell you will have to pay 20 or 30 or 40, or as it is in the case of Russia and America 80 or 100, per cent. on the value of your goods. Then you can sell in our markets with all the pleasure in the world." And that is what the right hon. Gentleman persists in describing to the people in this country as free trade. It is perfectly free to the foreign manufacturers and the foreign workmen, but it is the reverse of free so far as the manufacturers and workmen of this country are concerned, who are just as much entitled to earn good wages as their rival workmen in foreign countries. Hundreds and thousands of those men have come to the conclusion that this ridiculous and old-fashioned system must come to an end. How different the circumstances of to-day would be, the great promoters of the present fiscal system under which we live never foresaw. One, and perhaps the most serious, circumstance of all was that there were many trades in this country at that time in which we were not approached, in which we stood alone miles and miles in front of any other country without a single rival in the world. While I am speaking in this House to-day, by more than one of these foreign countries we have been passed and beaten in the race for trade, and by one of them we have been outdistanced altogether. The Chancellor of the Exchequer and the President of the Board of Trade gave some figures at the Conference in support of the views which they put before the Colonial Premiers. I am going to put before the right hon. Gentlemen some figures now in support of the statement which I have this moment made. The figures which I am about to quote cannot be contradicted. They are the earliest figures, which I have got, with some trouble and labour to myself, from the first Blue-Book which was published by the Board of Trade on this subject. I am going to take the iron and steel trade as an illustration of what I mean, and I am going to try it by the test which is declared by the Board of Trade in that same Blue-book to be the best, as to the progress of the trade that could be applied by any country in the world, namely, the production and consumption of pig-iron. What is the progress of Germany and the United States as compared with our progress in this country? I will take the production of pig-iron first, and then hon. Gentlemen can judge for themselves. These figures are indeed very remarkable, and I am only surprised that they were not quoted at the Conference; I may be wrong, but I have not been able to find any reference to them. I have taken the figures in quinquennial periods from 1876 to 1880 to start with, and down to the present time. It was in 1879 that Prince Bismarck abandoned free trade and took to the protective policy. In 1876–80 the United Kingdom produced 6,700,000 tons of pig-iron. In 1901–5 she produced 8,600,000 tons of pig-iron. What is the case with Germany? In the same years, 1876–80, Germany produced 2,100,000 tons, but in 1905 Germany produced 9,500,000 tons, having beaten us handsomely in the meantime. In the United States in 1876–80 they produced 2,200,000 tons, but in the year 1905 they produced 16,400,000 tons. That was pretty good, but it is nothing to what happened in 1906. I have been able to obtain the latest figures on that subject. In 1906 we reached a total of 10,100,000 tons; Germany reached a total of 12,300,000 tons; while the United States reached a total of 25,300,000 tons. And it must be remembered that the advance of those two countries has been from 2,000,000, while the advance in our case has been from 6,700,000 tons. I venture to say that these figures are of a most remarkable and striking character, and all the more remarkable and striking when you remember that in other trades, in the cotton trade, and to some extent in the textile trades, the figures seem similar in their effect, but not to the same extent as in the iron and steel trade. Surely, that is a matter for grave and serious reflection, especially when you remember that the iron and steel trade is so important that it has been described over and over again as the key to our national industries. What is the reason for it? There seems to be some good reason for a position of affairs like this, and if I may keep the House a few minutes longer I will make good what I believe to be the reason. This is the reason, and it is one which has been given to me over and over again by the greatest manufacturers in the country. What they always say is that the key of the commercial position, of successful commercial competition, is larger production. And that is the whole secret. Cheap production is large production. There is not a manufacturer in England, and if there is one in the House at this moment I am certain he also will agree, but will say that the more largely we can produce the more cheaply we can produce. To have a large production the very first essential of all is that you shall always have the largest possible markets, perfectly free and open; otherwise, if you have not, you may be left with a great surplus of production which you will find it almost impossible to dispose of. Will the House bear with me while I ask them to compare our position in this respect with that of our foreign rivals. They have always two great markets open to them—they have their own, which they take pretty good care to keep to themselves by protective duties; they have also ours, which is still open to the whole world. When they have satisfied their own demand, if they have a surplus left, as constantly they have, they send it over here. They are men of business, and they try to get the best price they can; still, at the same time, they know that they must sell it for whatever it will fetch, and over and over again it has happened in the past, and it will happen in the future again, they sell for less than it has cost to produce. That is what is called "dumping," which has done such infinite harm to the trade of this country in the past and will do infinite harm again in the future, as certainly as I am talking to this House, unless we take steps to prevent and change the present unworthy state of things. But that is not the only consequence of this character. Owing to our long and persistent pursuance of this foolish course we have to a large extent lost already, and we are losing still in a great degree, the great foreign market of the world which we formerly commanded almost as we willed. If we are to continue to remain a great prosperous commercial country in the future as we have been in the past, it is certain that other markets must be found in order to replace those we have lost. Where are they to be found? The Colonies have told you. They are ready, they have been ready for years to place their markets at our disposal, to give us the monopoly of them, if we had not been so foolish as to reject their offers. I remember that it has been said over and over again that they have never made us any offer of the kind. It is recorded in the Blue-book of 1902, in what is called the Memorandum of the Canadian Premiers—

> "If you will only give us 1s. duty on corn, the preference which is now in existence, or any other future duties you may impose on corn, although we give you a preference of 33 per cent. already, we will go back to our country, and we will do everything in our power with the Government and Parliament to increase and largely increase our preference still."

I am bound to say that this was accompanied a few paragraphs further on by a grave and serious warning, which was to this effect, that if after making every effort in this country arrangements of that sort could not be made, then Canada would reserve to herself the right to take any course in the world she pleased. After waiting several years that has taken shape at last in the new Canadian tariff which was issued seven months ago, and in that tariff a new intermediate tariff, as it is called, which it includes, has, I say, all the possibilities of very considerable injury to this country in the future, and injury which might have been entirely avoided if we had taken a course different from that which we have taken. I feel that I have been addressing the House at very considerable length, and I think that the House will desire that I should not trespass upon them at any greater length than I have done. All I wish to say in conclusion is that I deeply regret the attitude which His Majesty's Government think they were compelled to adopt at the Conference which came to a conclusion a very short time ago. I regret perhaps also to some extent that the refusals of His Majesty's Government were not couched in milder and softer language than sometimes they use. I am perfectly aware of this, that on both sides the feelings entertained by the members of the British Government with regard to the Colonial Premiers, and the feelings entertained by the Colonial Premiers towards the members of the Government, were such that nothing could be more cordial or more friendly. But I cannot help thinking somehow, whatever may be said as to what they ought to have expected, that when these men came from so many parts of the world—coming thousands of miles to discuss a subject of vital importance and interest to them—that it is too much to expect of human nature that they would not be gravely disappointed when all their hopes and aspirations were roughly brought to a close. We are told that the Government could not be false to their pledges or to the mandates which they had received from the country. I have said already what I think with regard to this mandate, but from that time to the present there has been a great and considerable change of opinion, which is, I believe, growing steadily and even rapidly from day to day. And what is the sacrifice which, after all, we are asked to make? The right hon. Gentleman opposite to me towards the close of his speech at the Conference made an appeal which would have been moving and powerful if it had had a better foundation. He concluded in these words—

> "We are not refusing to meet you, I can assure you. We are anxious in our hearts to do it,

> but we have here a poor population that you know nothing of. Here numbers of our poor people are steeped in poverty, and we have to think of them. It would be wrong of us, it would be cruel of us, it would be wicked of us, if we did not do it. I am sure if you realise that it would mean 2s. more for people who are already short of shillings to buy the very necessaries of life, you would be the last people in the world to come and beg us to add to the troubles of this poor population of ours. That is really why we are hesitating."

That is why we hesitate. If the views of the right hon. Gentleman could be supported by the facts of the case, which they cannot, I should be the first person in this House to hesitate. To talk of a 2s. duty on corn as involving an expense of 2s. more on the poorest people of this country is the strangest and wildest calculation that was ever submitted to the House of Commons. I think I have shown that the 2s. duty on foreign corn, that is on half the corn coming from our own Colonies and Possessions, is only the equivalent of a 1s. duty on the whole. Will the right hon. Gentleman opposite, for his own satisfaction as well as for mine, allow me to put before him a little calculation which I have made with the assistance of one of the largest bakers in this country—I believe he is the chairman of the Bakers' Association—and he is one of the greatest millers in the South of England. I think this little calculation will do something to remove the apprehensions of the right hon. Gentleman opposite. Hon. Members must remember that when the 1s. duty on corn was first imposed by Sir Michael Hicks-Beach a corresponding duty of 5d. per cwt. was imposed at the same time on flour, which was rather the heavier in proportion of the two. In order to be on the safe side I made my calculation with the assistance I have referred to upon the flour, and it comes to this: Every sack contains 2½ cwts. of flour, the duty would be 12½d. per sack, and from every sack is made between 96 and 100 loaves, according to the quality of the flour. If you divide 12½d. into anything over 100 loaves it will come out at something less than half a farthing on each loaf. When the right hon. Gentleman talks of the 2s. duty being imposed on all the poor people I would remind him that what it really would impose is that if the price of bread changed at all it would be something less than half a farthing. That is an absolute fact, and I do not believe it admits of any possible contradiction. [AN HON MEMBER: Who pays the half-farthing?] It is just the same thing when in order to raise additional revenue the Chancellor of the Exchequer put an additional shilling on a barrel of beer. I know it makes the brewers exceptionally angry, because they know they cannot get the tax back again out of the consumer as the number of glasses in a barrel of beer is so enormous that it is impossible to get the duty back in this way and the whole thing becomes absurd and impossible at once. For the reasons I have given I regret with all my heart the final decision of the Government with regard to the appeal made by the Colonies at the Conference. But be that as it may, it is all over now and settled, at all events, for the time. I for one shall never forget that the policy put forward at that Conference was a great Imperial policy and nothing else. It was a policy vital to this country, vital to its future commercial prosperity, vital to the interests of the Colonies as they believed themselves, and vital in my humble opinion to the future of this great Empire as a whole. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, so long as I am granted health and strength to do it, I, am determined that I for one at least will give all my efforts and all my energies to the prosecution of a cause which is so vital to the interests of all classes in this country, but to no class so vital as that which depends for its livelihood and welfare upon constant employment. For these reasons I shall devote whatever health and strength is left to me to this cause, for a better, higher, or a nobler cause either to stand or fall in no English Minister and no English statesman need desire.

MR. CURRAN (Durham, Jarrow) said he had a very difficult task before him in rising to make his maiden effort after the speeches of two distinguished statesmen. However, it was an ordeal they all had to go through, and he desired to face it and get it over at the earliest opportunity. It was a very strange coincidence that the noble Lord who had recently been returned for the Hornsey Division and himself were both making their maiden efforts on the same evening. There was this distinction between them. In the constituency which he represented they knew exactly how many tariff reformers there were, and he did not think the noble Lord the Member for Hornsey knew exactly the strength of the Tariff Reform Party in his own division because he was fortunate enough not to be called upon to bear the responsibility and endure the exertions of a contest. During the election at Jarrow they had visits from many distinguished people, including the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wimbledon, who went to woo the Jarrow electors in favour of tariff reform. They were also favoured with a visit from the hon. Member representing the newer school of tariff reform, the hon. Member for Dulwich, and after the brilliant efforts of those two gentlemen and a number of lesser lights, and a most exorbitant form of expenditure, they were only able to persuade one-fourth of the electors of Jarrow that tariff reform was a good thing. In regard to the attitude of the Government he noticed that all the newspapers which supported the Government had declared that Jarrow was a victory for Free trade. He did not wish to question that statement, but at the same time he repudiated any attempt on the part of Ministerialists to claim any credit for his return. His position in the House made him the most independent member of an independent Party because he had been opposed by every political party in Jarrow. Labour secured the victory off its own bat, and in Jarrow as elsewhere, where the Labour Party had stood and succeeded in obtaining seats they kept the free trade flag flying. He believed he was speaking not only for himself, but for his colleagues as well, when he said that they were absolutely against the imposition of a tax upon any kind of imported commodities either in the shape of raw material or foodstuffs, because they were convinced that, so far as a remedy for poverty was concerned, such a tax would be an absolute economic fallacy. The noble Lord who made his maiden speech earlier in the evening had referred to trade unionists being essentially protectionists, but that was a very old and exploded statement which had been used by tariff reformers ever since their campaign was opened some years ago. In the trade union world they combined together to protect themselves not against imposing duties, but against the class to which the noble Lord belonged. They had to protect themselves against capitalistic encroachments, and they did this in their collective capacity by contributing to their respective trade combinations. He submitted that there was no analogy whatever between that form of protection and the taxation of commodities which had been suggested on the opposition side of the House. Personally, he did not think that even the Government were sufficiently free trade in their policy. He recollected when he was a lad being connected with the Radical school of thought which a quarter of a century ago had for its political war cry the emancipation of the breakfast table. Strange to say upon his entry into Parliament he found himself called upon to record his first vote against the Government because it distinctly refused to emancipate the breakfast table. The point he wished to impress on the House was that what they wanted was not taxation of commodities, but relief from tariffs which burdened them at the present time. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wimbledon when making comparisons between this and other countries in regard to iron ore, strangely enough did not mention the royalty rents paid in this country as compared with the small contributions which were levied in the countries which he quoted. If the right hon. Gentleman seriously believed in tariff reform, he hoped he would join the Labour Party and remove the tariff levied by the landed proprietors of the country, which was strangling the iron and steel industry. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would also join in the crusade against exorbitant railway rates, and against the ground rents levied by the class to which he belonged. These were Labour points of tariff reform, and instead of assisting in bringing about the imposition of taxes upon imported commodities, he and his friends wanted Parliament, not next year, or the year after, but there and then, to tackle these problems and remove the tariffs which he had mentioned. No one had referred in the debate to the increase in the power of wealth production in the United Kingdom. The hon. Member for North Paddington had written a book recently which proved that our wealth-producing power had gone up by leaps and bounds, that the national income was increasing year by year, and, paradoxical as it might seem, that there had also been an increase in unemployed, and a general increase of poverty and destitution in the lower paid section of the community. That was not due to free trade. It was due to many agencies, but the chief was the general development of mechanical science. In the shipbuilding and engineering industries the ratio of production was going up, but it was going up with less people employed. He was not going to declaim against the development of mechanical science. He and his friends were in favour of that development, but they were against the private monopoly of that development being used for the aggrandisement of a section of the community, and until either the present or some future Government saw its way to tax the unearned increment, and also the unearned income, and bring back to the community some share of the general results of the development of the mechanical and other sciences, we would always have poverty and destitution in our midst. In a word, he and his friends stood against the imposition of taxes in the sense justified by tariff reformers, and they stood for the development of public ownership. Of course they would be told that it was socialism, confiscation, and anarchy to talk about the development of public ownership of the concerns which were run as monopolies to-day. So far as he was concerned he cared not by what name it was called, and he cared not what class of politician was against it, and his presence there went to show that the workers of the country were rising to the necessity of pushing forward the principle of public ownership as against the various other nostrums which were prescribed by other schools of political thought. He and his friends believed in taxing land values by a graduated process up to 20s. in the £1. He was sure the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wimbledon would join in that crusade. They stood for the bringing under direct control of the Government the railway system of this country. They believed that if the land was taxed to its full value, and the railway system brought under public control, this country would be able successfully to compete with any nation in the world so far as our staple industries were concerned. The Labour Party were pledged to do their utmost to persuade the present Government to introduce those comprehensive reforms, and if they were not successful in converting the Ministry, they would have to try to convert their supporters in the country with a view to having the monopolies which were run to-day for the advantage of a small Minority brought under public control and used for the general good of the community.

LORD R. CECIL said the speech of the hon. Member for the Jarrow Division was one of very great interest, and he felt sure that the whole House had listened to him with the greatest interest and pleasure. If he might offer one criticism, it was that the speech was not really applied to the question before the House. The hon. Member dealt with protection and possible alternatives. Protection might, and he had no doubt would, engage the attention of the House on some future occasion, but he did not apprehend that the Motion of his right hon. friend raised that question on the present occasion. The consideration of this Motion had given him personally a good deal of anxiety, and he had felt that his position and the position of those who agreed with him was one of very difficulty. He was not against Colonial preference in itself, but on the other hand he was against a preferential system based on the taxation of corn or other food commodities. Anyone who did him the honour of considering his present action would probably misunderstand him. If he voted against the Motion it would be said he was not in favour of Colonial preference at all, that he did not desire the consolidation of the Empire, and that he was, if an Imperialist at all, one of a somewhat wishy-washy character who did not deserve the name. If, on the other hand he voted in favour of the Motion, some hon. Members and people outside would say that he had yielded the whole of the free trade position, and that he was in favour of a tax on corn. It was the fate of a politician to be exposed to misunderstanding, and it was also a necessary incident of political life that no single question could be considered apart from all other questions. They had to consider not only the actual question before the House, but also what would be the effect of the decision of the House upon other questions which were before the country. He could not conceal from himself that the policy which the Government had recently definitely adopted had added very greatly to the difficulty of the position. They had adopted the policy of practically abolishing the House of Lords, and with that would go, in his judgment, the security for religious education, and the security against Home Rule. He saw no weakening in the claim of those opposed to his view on religious education. On the contrary, he understood that they were as extreme as they ever were. He saw no weakening in the proposals of those who advocated Home Rule. On the contrary, they went so far as to claim the sovereign independence of Ireland. That being so, he had decided to vote in favour of this Motion. Though, as he had said, he was not against Colonial preference in itself, he had the gravest doubts about the wisdom of what might be called the policy of preferential bargains, and as to the desirability of a policy which was to consist in bargains between this country and the Colonies by which we were to get certain commercial advantages and they were to give us other commercial advantages. He did not see any ground in history for thinking that that would lead to the unity of the Empire—he looked in vain for any historical precedent that would sanction that idea. He knew that the common precedent given was that of the German Zollverein. He did not wish at the moment to enlarge on the enormous differences between the German Empire and the British Empire, but the whole point of the Zollverein was the abolition of the internal customs. If they did away with custom houses they destroyed one of the greatest disintegrating influences that could possibly exist. One knew, when travelling, that the first thing that impressed upon one that one had come to a new sovereignty was the visit of the custom house officers; it was the first exercise of the sovereign power of the new country into which one was going, and no one could have lived near a frontier without seeing how the existence of the custom house divided two countries profoundly one from the other. Therefore, to abolish custom houses was a very important thing in unifying two countries, and he had sometimes grieved that in the British Empire, if they might not indeed abolish custom houses altogether, which was not, he was afraid, within the range of practical politics, they did not do something to abolish custom houses as between themselves and their Colonies. He would like to see some kind of Imperial customs system which would at any rate enable all goods and people coming from the Colonies into this country to come in absolutely free, without any examination or interference at all, and even if that were not possible he did not see why passengers and their effects—within certain limits of weight—whether going from England to the Colonies, or coming from the Colonies to England, should not come in perfectly free, without any customs examination, and he thought that would have an enormous moral effect. That, he thought, would be a step towards free trade within the Empire, with which, he believed, with some very small exceptions, they were all in that House in agreement, believing that it would be a most desirable thing in the interests of commerce. He knew there were many hon. and right hon. Members who held that view, and he knew only of one important section—he would not say that, but as far as his side of the House was concerned, the Unionist Party, he believed there was only one section that distrusted that ideal, and that was the section represented by the *Morning Post* newspaper. He did not pretend to understand it, but when the *Morning Post* was not denouncing the wiles and machinations of the Cecil family, it was arguing against the desirability of absolute free trade within the Empire. He would pass not to the historic argument in favour of preferential bargains, but rather to the argument which rested on the theory that increased commercial relations meant increased friendship between two countries. It might be so—he did not say it was not—but he did not see much sign of it in history. Hon. Members would recollect the celebrated French commercial treaty, and they would also recollect that at that very period the suspicion of hostility between France and England was certainly not less—he thought it probably was greater—than at almost any other recent period of history, and if commercial intercourse really was so favourable to international friendship, it was a remarkable thing that the country with whom we had at this moment by far the largest commercial intercourse, viz., Germany, was not the one which he thought would be generally signalled by any Member of that House as the one with whom we had the warmest possible relations. It was said that even apart from the historic and commercial arguments, they might use the analogy of individuals; that individuals who had commercial relations with one another were apt to become more friendly. Well, he believed that to be true if the individuals were strangers, but he did not think it was true in individuals who were related to one another, and he thought everybody knew that a commercial transaction in a family itself was one of the things that most tested the affections and unity of that family. The reason was that each member of the family was conscious that in his own motives and in the motives of the other there were two elements—affection and commercial advantage, and he always suspected, or was apt to suspect, that he was, in the common phrase, being put upon by his relative, who was relying on his affection and feeling of family unity and thereby sucking out no small advantage. Therefore, though he did not pretend that they could press this analogy too far, he pressed it very much upon them whether there was not a danger that in such bargains there would always be the rankling feeling between the parties to the bargain that one or the other was relying too much upon Imperial feeling and thereby obtaining advantage of a commercial character from the other. If he might press the analogy of the family one step further, though a bargain tended to the disruption of families, the interchange of presents tended to their union. That was to his mind, though a somewhat trivial ilustration in the mind of the House, the true attitude of mind in which to approach this question. By all means let them give advantage to the Colonies and receive advantage from the Colonies, but let it not be by way of bargains, let it not be a transaction of a commercial character. Let it rather be the interchange of free presents, such as Christmas presents between the members of a family. And from that point of view, and in that sense, he was strongly in favour of giving preferential advantages to the Colonies, but they must be what we could afford to give and what they desired to obtain; and on that ground, and because he believed very much in the desirability of that kind of intercourse between ourselves and other parts of the Empire, he saw no objection—on the contrary, he saw great advantages—to the granting of preferences on existing taxation. That seemed to him to be in every respect a desirable course to take. The hon. Member who spoke last said he desired relief from the present taxes. Well, the merit of a preference given on existing taxation was that its action was not by imposing new taxes, but by the remission or modification of existing taxes. That seemed to him to make a complete distinction from a preferential system based on the imposition of new taxes. The Under-Secretary had said that afternoon that that gave away the whole issue between free trade and protection, and he had listened to that statement with absolute amazement; he could not conceive why the right hon. Gentleman said it. The proposal was that on existing duties they should charge rather less if the imported article came from the Colonies than they did if it came from foreign parts. How could the remission of taxation be a measure in the direction of protection? He was utterly unable to understand it, and he thought if there was such an objection on the ground of principle, the objection came rather late. They had enjoyed for many years preferences from Canada and from other parts of the Empire. Surely, if they thought the whole system utterly vicious, they ought to have raised their protest when the matter was first mooted by the Colonies.

They had done nothing of the kind; they had accepted these preferences, and the present Government, the President of the Board of Trade among the rest, had said in the strongest way that he valued these preferences and thought them admirable and that they were most generous to this country. It therefore appeared rather late for them to say that there was an objection on principle to differential treatment based on existing taxation. The other arguments that were used were that after all it would be a very trivial affair, that the amount of the advantage they could give to the Colonies was a very small one. He agreed that it was very small, but he thought the Colonial Conference had made all the difference in that respect. They had had the Colonial Prime Ministers there, and they said unanimously—with the exception of the Home Government he understood Dr. Jameson's Motion was accepted unanimously — "We should like you to give us this preference, although we recognise that the matter is small, and does not make a very great deal of difference, still we should like it and should value it as a token and a pledge of your affection to us." He did not see why the Government refused to do that. On the strictest and most orthodox ground of free trade he could not see why it was objectionable; it seemed to him desirable from every point of view, and however trivial it might be, if the Colonies desired it the objection on the score of triviality fell to the ground. He was aware that Dr. Jameson said he desired it as an admission of a principle, but the principle was not the imposition of new duties; he could conceive that that would be a dangerous principle from the point of view of the orthodox free-trader, but that the remission of an existing duty was a dangerous principle he could not for the life of him understand.

Mr. LUPTON: The difference is this —on Colonial goods the nation would pay the tax, but the Exchequer would not reap the benefit of it.

Lord R. CECIL said he did not follow what the hon. Member meant. He was surprised to hear from the right hon. Gentleman the Under-Secretary for the Colonies a wholly new objection, viz., that it would involve a very serious loss to revenue. He had talked of £36,000,000 of revenue being affected, but he (Lord R. Cecil) could not understand what he meant. He thought it was conceded that the whole revenue that would be affected would be a very small amount of £100,000, and therefore he did not understand why the right hon. Gentleman suggested that a revenue of £36,000,000 would be affected. He was opposed to a tax on corn and meat, and he refrained from considering the question whether a small duty was paid by the consumer or the producer. His objection to the suggested duty was based on political grounds. The essential characteristic of our system of Government was its party character, and when any party question was raised, it must inevitably be opposed by the opposing Party. It was, therefore, impossible to disregard the fact that a tax on corn had been for the last sixty years treated as a party question; and if preferential treatment of corn and meat were raised, the Opposition was raising a distinct party issue. He could not contemplate that position without severe misgiving, and he did not believe that the political campaign which would be started against such a preference would make for the unity of the Empire. If one Party really adopted this policy of a preferential system of taxation of corn, then the inevitable consequence would be that the Empire, in all its details, would become the ordinary topic of party politics. He looked upon that prospect with dismay, and he appealed to his hon. friends to consider whether there was not some other form or method of preference by which their legitimate wishes might be realised without plunging the Empire into the great danger which would arise from the adoption of the preferential system.

*Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I much regret that I have not had the opportunity of listening to more of the noble Lord's speech than the few concluding sentences, because I was deeply anxious to hear what he had to say upon the subject. I know that the noble Lord holds a rather peculiar position in his Party on this matter, and I am much surprised that he has come to the conclusion that it is perfectly consistent with his principles to vote for the Resolution. I thought the noble Lord was a free trader, but the worst of it is that he has rather adopted the method which has been pursued by his right hon. relative for the last four or five years, of giving his own interpretation to terms to which another meaning is given by the vast majority of the people with whom he is associated, and by all on this side of the House, so that he will vote with men with whom he profoundly disagrees. I appeal to the noble Lord, and to all who are honest free traders, to say whether there is not a real danger in adopting an attitude of that kind merely for the sake of a temporary party adjustment. The noble Lord knows that the right hon. Member for St. George's has a totally different interpretation from his own. The noble Lord is against the taxation of corn.

LORD R. CECIL said he had listened very carefully to his right hon. friend's speech, and did not understand him to say that he regarded his Resolution as necessarily involving the taxation of food. He understood him to say the contrary.

*MR. LLOYD-GEORGE : I am quite certain that the right hon. Member for St. George's, Hanover Square, would be the last man in the world to say that by a preference arrangement with the Colonies he does not contemplate some preferential tariff on the produce of the Colonies. He disclaimed any intention of imposing a tariff on raw material, but he unequivocally stated that he was in favour of the taxation of food. And that was the ground upon which he moved his Amendment. How can the noble Lord support this Resolution, moved by preferentialists who believe in the taxation of corn? That is the broad way which leads to protection; it is the way along which the Leader of the Opposition has already skidded. He, however, is not present, and I will reserve what I have to say about him until he arrives. In the meantime I will devote a few moments to examining what was said by—I will not say a more straightforward gentleman—but a gentleman who expounded his views more clearly. I allude to the right hon. Member for Wimbledon. The right hon. Member for Wimbledon is a pure, straightforward protectionist. He has always supported Motions in favour of bimetallism, taxation on food, and quack remedies of that kind. The advantage of his speech to-night is this, that it did not merely dally with the question of preference on Colonial products. He at great length expounded his views on a general tariff, which is perfectly relevant, because it is perfectly clear that if you are going to have a preference with the Colonies you must have a general tariff. If you put 2s. on corn and 10 per cent. on cattle, the industrial districts will insist on protection for their industries. You must have a general tariff, as the noble Lord knows perfectly well, and yet he is going into the same lobby with the right hon. Gentleman simply in order to express different views. The right hon. Gentleman is firmly convinced that this country is on the high road to ruin, and he refuses to allow encouraging Board of Trade figures to mar in the slightest degree that gloomy prospect. He brushes aside the Board of Trade statistics with contempt, and goes to a higher authority—the Tariff Reform Commission, of which he has been a member. The right hon. Gentleman challenged me to name any country in the world where our goods are free to enter. We are as free to enter all countries as any of our rivals. It is true there is a tariff against us in the United States, but we are just as free to enter as France or Germany there or in other countries, and the result is that when we enter those countries we beat all our rivals so far as the markets of protected countries are neutral. Every protected country has a neutral market for certain goods, and in those neutral markets we more than hold our own. Can the right hon. Member name any country that exports as much of its manufactured products as Great Britain? He was full of the United States and Germany. We beat them by scores of millions every year in the goods we manufacture and export. And our trade grows. In the course of a few years it has grown by something like £100,000,000. In fact, our trade owes an apology to right hon. Gentlemen opposite because it takes such an unconscionable time dying. Our exports are growing and expanding. [OPPOSITION cries of "Coal."] If hon. Gentlemen would study the official papers and not poison their minds with tariff reform leaflets, they would see that not in coal but in manufactured goods we sold abroad as much as any two other countries. The right hon. Gentleman referred to our textile trade of all things in the world. There has never been anything like our cotton trade. While in the quinquennial period 1902–6 as compared with 1897–1901 the United States, which grows all its own material, has increased its average annual cotton sales by £3,000,000 or £4,000,000 and Germany by £2,000,000, we have increased ours by over £20,000,000, whose material comes from thousands of miles away. Are we absolutely excluded from the markets of the world? This trade is not with the Colonies. I know it has been suggested that the expansion of our export trade is due to the Colonies. That is not the case. If you take the protective countries of the world, France, the United States, Germany, and the rest, we have extended our trade to them far more than to the Colonies during the last five years. I am quoting from memory, but I am certain I am right. Our exports of manufactured goods to the Colonies during the past five years have increased by £13,000,000, while the increase of our exports to protected countries has been some £20,000,000; and when you take countries like China and the Argentine Republic, our trade with them has increased by leaps and bounds. But it is no use quoting Board of Trade figures for the Member for Wimbledon. The right hon. Gentleman possesses that simple faith that thinks it can remove mountains by refusing to look at the map. The right hon. Gentleman declares that agriculture would benefit from his scheme. How? He was careful to explain that a duty of 2s. on corn would not increase the price. If that is the case how is the farmer to benefit? Here again it is no use arguing with the right hon. Gentleman. He is firmly convinced that you have only to manure this country with a compost of tariffs, and industries and rents will spring up and blossom like his own luxuriant rhetoric. Now that the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition is in his place, I should like to say that the real interest of the discussion centres round his expected speech. I need not dwell on the rhetorical merit which is always part of the right hon. Gentleman's utterances; but the real interest is to know what we are in for, or rather what he is in for. I wonder whether he realises for a moment that this vote of censure is meant for him. It is rather hard on us that we should be censured simply because hon. Gentlemen behind him suspect him—suspect that he is not straight. We are to be condemned for his shortcomings; we are to be hanged, drawn, and quartered for his treason. At last he is to be forced to-night to declare what he means. Really the interest of the discussion is to know whether he has been caught. It has been a long and rather curious process. I have watched it for years on that side of the House and now on this side. One has heard of armies chasing the foe, but this is the first time one has heard of an army pursuing its own general to capture him. For years he has successfully dodged his own troops. To-night we will wait to see whether he can show them another clean pair of heels. There are many things he is prepared to accept. He will not accept the whole of the programme, but to-night I am told he is to be forced at the point of the bayonet to cross this *pons asinorum*. We have been very anxious about it up to the very last. Watch the Press. They have been exceedingly anxious about it. [AN HON. MEMBER: No, no.] Yes; the hon. Gentleman does not read the *Morning Post*. If he did he would learn some home truths there. They have been just as anxious about him as the farmer is about the weather when his hay is cut and on the ground. They thought after the Albert Hall speech that the weather had settled; every spot had vanished from the sun. Then there was a little thundercloud in the neighbourhood of Hatfield and the weather broke up. In the meantime the tariff reform harvest was rotting in the fields. I looked at the glass this morning—at that letter which the right hon. Gentleman wrote. On the whole I think the indications are that the weather has set fair for the Tariff Reform League; but it all centres on the right hon. Gentleman, and the discussion is just to force him to declare his intentions—whether they are honourable. Lord Hugh Cecil said that he was still true to free trade. The hon. Member for Dulwich says that is not true.

Mr. BONAR LAW: I dealt only with the question of fact. I stated that I had heard that the extreme Tariff Reform Party had urged my right hon. friend to put down this Amendment. I stated that that was not the fact.

***Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE**: I accept the explanation. At any rate I have heard it avowed that he is faithful to tariff reform; but the *Morning Post* says that he is a heartless philanderer. This debate is intended to make clear what he means. It is well that we should know where the right hon. Gentleman stands, because it is a matter of considerable importance. We are to be censured. Why? Because we have said to the country clearly what we would do. We told the country before the election and we told the Colonial Premiers after the election. Can anyone say that the right hon. Gentleman has made a clear declaration of what his policy is? We are entitled to ask, for they are moving a vote of censure. This is no Motion of ours. This is his Motion; at least he has adopted it. We are entitled to ask, since he has asked for a day to discuss preference, and we have given it to him, will he now say whether he is in favour of putting a tax on corn with a view of giving a preference to the Colonies? He has rather implied it in the Albert Hall speech. He has never said so clearly. He has suggested it in the House of Commons. After all, the right hon Gentleman is a master of lucid utterance, and when he wants to make clear his intentions there is no man in Parliament who can do it better than he. Therefore I think we are entitled to ask him what he means. We can only guess what his policy is from the speech of the right hon. Gentleman who opened the debate. He is in favour of a tax on corn; but the right hon Gentleman who opened the debate rather tried to shunt the discussion on to Colonial wine. Should we not make a little allowance on Colonial wine, South African tobacco, and something which comes from Canada —I think it was rye whisky? Does the right hon. Gentleman opposite really suggest to the House that the Colonial Premiers came over with all their retinue merely to get a little off Colonial wine? Mr. Deakin had a special mandate from his constituents to demand preference, and in expounding his views to the Conference, I do not remember that he spent any time at all on Colonial wine. It was all wheat, mutton, and dairy produce. Somebody said it was discussed on Dr. Jameson's Resolution, but if you look at the proceedings you will see that the discussion lasted two and a half minutes in the course of which Mr. Deakin compressed his remarks into one line, which I should say was a fair indication of the importance he attached to the subject. The real question with the Colonial Premiers was as to wheat, dairy produce, meat, and so on, and not all the wine, tobacco, or rye whisky of all the Colonies put together. The Colonies are quite right. Certainly in regard to Australian and Cape wine, Natal tobacco, and Canadian whisky, I do not think there is a country in the world hitherto explored that has produced articles likely to compete seriously with these Colonial luxuries. Therefore they are quite right. They know perfectly well that the real question is with reference to wheat, meat, and dairy produce. Does the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition take the same view as the Colonial statesmen as to preference —that no preference is possible without putting a tax on these products? That is the real demand. There is a Resolution moved here from these benches, which the Government propose to support. It raises the issue whether the right hon. Gentleman and his friends are in favour of a protective tax on food. The right hon. Gentleman ran away from that Resolution when it was moved in the late Parliament. There was something to be said for running away then. He had just issued a pamphlet in which he talked about the downward tendencies of our trade, and at that time the returns issued from the Department presided over by his relative falsified every statement he made? After all, the right hon. Gentleman has before him the precedent of a prophet who has inaugurated a very successful era by flight. You have gone in for a succession of those flights. Does the right hon. Gentleman want to run away to-night? This is the real test of what he is in favour of, whether he is against the proposals put forward at the Conference, in the forefront practically, by Mr. Deakin, on behalf of the Colonial Premiers. I do not believe that Sir W. Laurier even referred to these little duties on Canadian whisky or things of that sort. He did not want to waste time over trifles of that kind. He wanted to get to business. We have heard a good deal about the slamming of the door. Have the Colonies any real right to complain of the trading relations between them and ourselves? We buy from the Colonies £93,000,000 worth of their products every year. We are the best market in the world. Free trade has made us the best market, and it is to the interest of the Colonies that we should preserve the system that has made us the best market. Foreign countries all over the world put together buy £40,000,000 worth from the Colonies. Therefore, we buy more than twice as much as all the foreign countries put together, and what right have the Colonies to complain? But they do not complain, and the complaint is put forward on their behalf without any authority. It is the sort of argument one hears in regard to the poor widow and orphan who has invested money in brewery shares, the object being to shield somebody else. No, it is not being put forward in order to protect the Colonies, but to get a 2s. tax on corn at home. What do the Colonies buy from us? They buy £63,000,000 from us and £59,000,000 from foreign countries. What is the balance of trade? We buy from them £30,000,000 worth more than they buy from us, while from the foreigner they buy £19,000,000 more than he buys from them. Is that favouring the old country? Can anyone imagine we are slamming the door against Colonial produce? Then, to take dutiable articles, we charge duties on 9 per cent. of the goods that come from foreign countries and other British Possessions, whereas we only charge on ·3 per cent. of the goods coming from the self-governing Colonies. We give them an enormous preference in our arrangement of the duties. Why, then, should right hon. Gentlemen complain on behalf of the Colonies when we treat them in this way? Right hon. Gentlemen opposite seem to have forgotten that when they were in power for ten years they rearranged the duties on goods coming from British Possessions. They raised the duties by 50 per cent. on goods coming from India, and they put on the sugar tax, and the only thing the present Government have done is to reduce the duty on tea which they put on; and to that extent we have done more for the Colonies than right hon. Gentlemen opposite. Then there is another point. If this country is going to become protectionist we must protect our goods against all our rivals. If we are going to protect the farmer, as the right hon. Gentleman opposite said——

Mr. CHAPLIN said it never entered into the mind of anyone that these duties were going to put the farmer on his legs again, or to regenerate agriculture; but he said that if the proceeds of the duties were applied to the aid of agriculture, then indirectly, but in no other way something would have been done for the advantage of agriculture.

*Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: There has never been anything like these proceeds since the widow's cruse. They are to be used for old-age pensions and the reduction of the income-tax, the sugar tax is to go, the tax on tea is to disappear, we are to encourage all sorts of local industries, and agriculture is to be set on it legs again. It is rather interesting to know that the right hon. Gentleman does not think in his wildest moments that a duty of 2s. on corn will have the slightest effect on agriculture. That is a very important admission, and coming from him it will carry very great weight indeed. But does anyone imagine that if we began a protective system in this country we must not protect all round? Does the right hon. Gentleman think he can protect the iron, steel, cotton, and wool industries and leave the farmer in the lurch with only a sort of deferred share as against all these preference shares and debentures, and second preference and ordinary shares—with only a deferred share in this limited sum which is to be raised? Does he think he is going to satisfy the farmers with that? His powers of persuasion are great. No doubt the right hon. Gentleman has persuaded his constituents at Wimbledon—[An Hon. Member: They are not farmers]—that they have simply to put a tax on corn and enough corn will be grown on Wimbledon Common to supply all our needs. If we start this kind of thing, will it matter to the farmer if he cannot sell his butter, whether he is kept out of the market by his Australian cousin or his Danish second cousin ? It is all the same to him. Hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite have had the opportunity, and may have it again, of showing their determination to make a sacrifice for the Colonies by means of trade in one way. Supposing we take off the embargo on Canadian cattle. It has been put on, and it has created great resentment in Canada. At any rate, I voted steadily against it. Nothing shows more clearly the danger of once imposing these protective systems. Once you put them on, it is exceedingly difficult to take them off. At any rate, if you take them off, it would not increase the cost; it would diminish it. I only want hon. Members opposite to put this as a test to their Imperial friends. Supposing that they go down to a Primrose League gathering in a rural district, and say that, in order to propitiate our Canadian fellow-citizens, it is proposed to take off the embargo, and then follow it up by asking the audience to join in the chorus, "The Maple Leaf for Ever." That would give us a real test of whether they mean only to protect their own industries or to advance the interests of the Colonies. This is a protectionist dodge from beginning to end. I am one of those who would do a great deal to unite the Colonies to the Mother Country even more closely than they are united at the present moment. When we hear of the sacrifices made by the Colonies for the Mother Country, I do not doubt them; but I think they are even greater in the promise of what the Colonies might do for us in a great emergency than they are in anything which has been accomplished up to the present. But are they the only nationalities in the Empire that have made sacrifices for the Empire ? We are not to refuse anything which the Colonies ask, because they have made sacrifices. There are other nationalities that have made sacrifices. I will take, if you like, Irishmen. Irishmen are not very effusive in their expressions of loyalty to the Empire, but in every great war waged for the honour or the aggrandisement of the Empire, more Irishmen proportionately to their numbers have fallen defending the Flag than of any other nationality of the Empire. Yet Ireland has been asking for the last fifty years at least for a boon which has been long conceded to the Colonies—namely, self-government. Where were those great Imperialists then ? Did they come around and say, "You ought not to refuse this demand made upon the Empire" ? On the contrary, they have slammed the door themselves with insolent contempt. This is, undoubtedly, the Motherland, but it is the Motherland, not merely of the Colonies, but of 43,000,000 of people at home, and her first obligation after all is to the people upon her own hearth. A mother who is always neglecting those who remain under her roof-tree and running about protecting those who have left her and set up for themselves a happy and prosperous household elsewhere, is a bad mother and a worse mother-in-law. She is a blight upon both households. I would like to bring the Empire and the Colonies nearer; it would be a great advantage, not merely to the people of the Colonies, but to the people of this country. The nearer we can bring the people of the Colonies to this country, the better will the people of this country see what is happening in the Colonies. It would show the people of this country how their Colonial kinsmen are able to thrive and prosper without institutions, systems, and laws which are regarded here as part of the essentials of civilisation. They would be able to see, for instance, how the Colonies can get on without a State Church and yet how religion is more of a living force. Then I would like the people of this country to see how the Colonies have settled the education question and how the Colonies have got on without tricks and dodges for defeating the will of the people. The bringing of the Colonies nearer would, I think, accelerate the day when the people of this country will insist upon having themselves the same privileges and freedom which are enjoyed by their Colonial kinsmen. But this proposal would ruin the Empire and throw us further apart. It is a proposal to set one democracy preying upon another; it is a proposal which would put us in the bondage of great and greedy trusts which oppress honesty and industry, and threaten the very integrity of States. I am all for binding the Empire together, but let us see, at any rate that the cords do not cut right into the flesh of the people.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have always recognised frankly and fully the ingenuity of the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down. But I am bound to say I never knew that ingenuity set itself so hard a task or accomplish it more successfully, than to drag into a speech on our commercial relations with the Colonies a tirade upon the brilliant achievements of our Irish fellow-countrymen in the field—a discussion, brief but pregnant, upon Home Rule, a sly dig at the House of Lords, and the general expression of a wish that we could more closely model our whole policy and procedure upon that of our free, self-governing Colonies. Is it a fiscal matter? It is quite true that the right hon. Gentleman's views are that the Colonies are blessed in the absence of a House of Lords, of an Established Church, of bad education, but when he desires that we should so study the methods of the Colonies as to imitate them upon every particular, I am rather surprised that he did not remember that in the one particular which we are occupied in discussing to-night, absolutely the only question which is relevant to this debate, in the first place the Colonies are protectionists, and in the second place, the Colonies are unanimously in favour of that policy which the right hon. Gentleman so vehemently repudiates. I think that, perhaps, that reference of the right hon. Gentleman, which did not bear any marks of premeditation about it, might well have been omitted both from his own point of view and from the general point of view that perhaps we ought only to discuss one subject at a time in this House. But if we ought only to discuss one subject at a time, that subject is divided on the present occasion by the fact that there is before us both a Resolution and an Amendment to that Resolution, which I understand to be an Amendment officially favoured by the gentlemen on the Front Bench opposite. It is extraordinary, that being so, how little we have heard of it. There have been a great many speeches directed towards the Resolution, but there really has been no speech—I can hardly make an exception in favour of the mover of the Amendment itself—which showed the smallest interest in that Parliamentary production. I believe that the Amendment really was introduced merely as an indirect but effective compliment to the Under-Secretary for the Colonies, because, I understand, what I admit I had forgotten during the course of the debate, that it is word for word taken from a Resolution which occurred to the ingenious mind of the Under-Secretary two or three years ago when he was in a position of less responsibility than he is at the present time; but I do not know why the Government on this occasion have raked in the dead cinders of *Hansard* in order to find some of the earlier efforts of the Under-Secretary for the Colonies and to reproduce them as the fine flower, the perfection, of all that can be done in the way of Parliamentary tactics and strategy on the present occasion. I have said that there has been very little reference to the Amendment, and I think it will be admitted on all sides, but I do not deny that there have been passing sentences of eulogy devoted to it, and by nobody more than by its original author—and that was only right, after all—the right hon. Gentleman the present Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies; and what was his particular praise of that Amendment? He said the Resolution of my right hon. friend was an ambiguous Resolution; nobody could make out what its purport was, and that the Amendment was clear, precise, and unmistakeable in its character; that everybody knew exactly what was meant by a protective duty on food, and that, therefore, we could have a clear-cut and plain division. Well, Sir, that is great nonsense. And everybody who has the Parliamentary history of the last five or six years in his mind knows that it is great nonsense. Just let us cast our minds back for one moment to a period anterior to the fiscal controversy—not a great effort historically, because the fiscal controversy began in 1903, and I am only asking hon. Gentlemen to cast their minds back to 1901 and 1902, and if they can go back to the beginning of the fiscal controversy that further effort will not be beyond their strength. Before the fiscal controversy the late Government, for fiscal reasons, put a shilling duty on corn, and we had the most prolonged discussions in this House as to whether that was a protective duty or whether it was not. And at the moment, as everybody knows, we are divided in this House as to whether that was a protective duty or not. Yes, we are divided now. The present Prime Minister and the present Chancellor of the Exchequer declared that it was a protective duty. The then Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Michael Hicks Beach, and we now on this side of the House, I among others, said it was not a protective duty.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: The then Chancellor of the Exchequer said he was convinced it was.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I should like to see the quotation, but I am quite certain that I did support it and took a part in the debates at that time, and that he and I were absolutely agreed that it was not a protective duty; but that shows that there is an ambiguity in the phrase which at all events prevents the Amendment having the very quality which its original author attributed to it, the quality of being unambiguous. It is essentially ambiguous. Perhaps hon. Gentlemen think that there was no good economist—at all events, there may have been some wretched people now sitting on this side of the House, like myself and others, ignorant of the principles of political economy who deny that it was protective in its character—but that no sound, no really learned economist would use that phrase; but I appeal to the most learned economist on that side of the House, the right hon. Gentleman the Under-Secretary for the Colonies, the author in 1905 of the Amendment which we are now discussing in 1907, but who was one of the defenders of the corn tax in 1902. The Under-Secretary for the Colonies—and I am sure he has not learned all his political economy since that time—in 1902 informed the House, and I entirely, or largely, agree with him, that there was not a single argument that could be urged against the corn tax that could not equally be urged against the tea duties. Nobody had ever said the tea duties were protective, and by parity of reasoning we must assume that the corn tax was not protective. And I, for my own part, have never contemplated, and I do not think anybody on this side has ever contemplated, a tax which could more properly be described as protective in the matter of food stuff than the tax which the right hon. Gentleman himself defended in 1902.

MR. CHURCHILL: I have not had an opportunity of verifying the speech to which the right hon. Gentleman refers, but I have a very clear recollection that I said the corn tax was technically protective, merely for the lack of countervailing excise.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Are we going to vote on something which is "technically" protective? The hon. Member who at the bidding of the Government has copied what the right hon. Gentleman said and put it down on the Paper practically in the name of the Government ought to add to it the word "technical," so that it would read: "In the opinion of this House the permanent unity of the British Empire will not be secured through a system of preferential duties based upon the *technically* protective taxation of food." I think the right hon. Gentleman will feel that the Amendment is, as it stands, extremely ambiguous, and that you cannot prevent it being ambiguous without making it ridiculous. We heard something about running away just now in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman. It seems to me that the Government want to run away from the question whether we should or should not use such a fiscal system as we possess for purposes of preferential duty—they want to run away from that behind something which has nothing whatever to do with that question, which is wholly irrelevant to it, which is in itself ambiguous, and which will absolutely prevent the House coming to a decision upon the only question which is before it. ["No, no."] The question which is before the House, not only technically but substantially, is not the question of whether there should be a protective duty on food, which nobody desires—[ironical cheers]—which nobody desires—["Oh, oh"]—and which has been expressly repudiated by the two speakers on this Bench who preceded me—namely, my right hon. friend the late Secretary for the Colonies and my right hon. friend the Member for Wimbledon. Nobody desires or has ever desired a protective duty on food; and to ask this House to leave the question which is before it, which is that of Colonial preference, and devote its attention to something which is not before it, which is a protective duty on food stuffs, which nobody desires, is directly to run away from the issue before the House. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade has been good enough to inform me that this Motion, suggested by me and submitted to me in its terminology, is directed against me. Well, he and I are fellow-sufferers. I am told that he is not beyond suspicion. He has, no doubt, done his best to redeem his character—as I am doing my best to redeem mine—by making a very violent attack on Colonial preference. But we have the right hon. Gentleman's speeches, the amiable and excellent speeches which he delivered to the Colonial Conference, and which have now been published. If the right hon. Gentleman had read out his own speeches to the Conference and had not delivered the carefully-prepared oration which he gave us to-night, the whole House would have said, "The right hon. Gentleman has gone over." He recognises as much as anybody, as much as the most ardent tariff reformer behind me, the enormous benefit given to British trade by the

Colonial preference we possess. He recognises its vast importance, and he thanked the Colonies for it; and that was not necessary if it was not true. I presume it is true. It is of enormous importance to British trade. I am bound to say that if the right hon. Gentleman and his friends behind him are agreed on the enormous importance to British trade of such preference as we already possess, and which, if we met the Colonies in the spirit they desired to meet us, would be a largely increased preference, then it seems to me that it is a very rash procedure on the part of any Government, be their majority what it may, and be the origin of that majority what it may, to slam the door, whoever the porter may be, in the face of those who come to us with a policy on which they are all agreed. Every self-governing Colony is agreed, and the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade, recognising all they are doing for us, says, in the name of his Government, that he and they mean to do nothing for the self-governing Colonies. I hold personally that if we could come to an arrangement with the Colonies in the matter of preference, it would be worth while to make some immediate sacrifices. [MINISTERIAL cries of "On what?"] I hold that now, and I have always held it, but I do not believe that these sacrifices are required. There must always be, in the situation that we have got to deal with, a great number of communities with their special needs and interests, and we with our special needs and interests. That constitutes the difficulty, not the impossibility. Let the House notice that that difficulty is vastly diminished by the difficulty in which we now find ourselves in reference to national finance. I doubt whether there is any careful student of contemporary finance who doubts that the present basis of taxation is one which cannot, by any possibility, be permanent. As long as anyone held out to himself the hope that we could make great economies in national expenditure, or cherished the conviction that under new Governments new sources of revenue would come in view, then he could tolerate the old system under which we have for so many years lived. But all these hopes are scattered to the wind. The Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Government to which he belongs all know perfectly well that national expenditure is not going to diminish. It is going to increase. I do not like it. He does not like it. Nobody likes it. But whether we like it or not, the facts are there; and I do not believe that you can face the increasing expenditure of this country, with all the new demands for social reform, on the present basis of taxation—income-tax at 1s. in the £, and 5s. duty on sugar. It cannot be done, and it ought not to be done. If the present Government had been well advised when they saw the strong and unanimous feeling exhibited by the Colonial Prime Ministers they would have said: "We hold certain views on this question, and we cannot alter fundamentally our system of taxation, but we will at all events use such taxation as we have—even though the results be trifling financially, though not Imperially—to carry out the wishes of the free, self-governing portions of the Empire." If they had done that they would have been well advised. But every man must believe that I am not prophesying in vain when I say that you will have to extend your basis of taxation, that you will have to diminish the taxation upon some things which are now taxed and diminish it in accordance with your own pledges. There is, for instance, the tax which by universal admission is a tax not only on the food of the people, but also on a raw material—the tax on sugar. This is a tax which violates both the canons which you wish to establish—that you should never put a tax on a raw material or on a necessity of life. That is a system of taxation which cannot stand. The basis of your fiscal system must inevitably be broadened. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Narrowed."] There are some hon. Gentlemen who hold certain views in favour of throwing the whole of the burdens on the shoulders of a single class in the country, but I am not going to be led off into any parenthesis on that subject. I am assuming that the general principles of equity and justice existing in all civilised countries will remain with us, and then without doubt will have to broaden the basis of taxation. Exactly what new taxes you will have to impose, how you will broaden your system, it is not my business at the present time to indicate. At all events, I am not going to put myself into the position of hon. Members opposite who made promises at the election and afterwards, which they do not fulfil. It is better after all to say you will wait till you are responsible to say what fiscal system you will adopt than to promise when you are not responsible that when you are responsible you will do something which you refuse to do when the time comes. If I am right in the prophesy that you must, on grounds wholly dissociated and distinct from the Colonial question widen the basis of taxation, all I ask is that the policy of those who have to widen that taxation—the policy which I recommend to the Government even on the present narrow basis, is to use the taxation they have, whether broad or narrow, for the purpose of giving such Colonial preference as is possible to the Colonies. That is all the Colonies ask for. They have not demanded of us that we should do that which from our own point of view is utterly inexpedient, but only that when we are carrying out a particular system of taxation we should do our best to make it a system which will bind the different parts of the Empire into one close, organic whole. I am well aware that hon. Gentlemen opposite have in their political armoury a great many very simple, and I think very fallacious, but still effective rhetorical points which they can use at by-elections or general elections, and out of which they can make great political play. But I ask hon. Members opposite whether they really think that the course they are adopting is in the long run going to promote the closer union between the different parts of the Empire, which I recognise they desire as much as we do. I attribute no mean motives to them. They have, I think, accused us on this side of being the mere instruments of financial and commercial interests; those charges I may be allowed to treat with contempt, and I do not retaliate. It would be very easy, it requires very small intelligence to make such charges, but at all events I do not mean to do it. I attribute to them as high a standard of Imperial patriotism as that which I endeavour myself to attain. But do they not see that by ignoring this general sentiment throughout the whole Empire, throughout all the self-governing portions of the Empire, though it be true that the Colonies are not on that account going to separate themselves from the Mother Country, they are nevertheless not going in the path which does, must, and ought to lead to that close feeling of a common interest which is the very bond and solid basis of Empire? I am sure they are wrong. If their only fear is that we on this side are going to lend ourselves to these illegitimate financial transactions of which they seem so much afraid, if they really seriously suppose that this House is going to become the creature of great financial corporations, I can assure them that no plan that has ever found favour either with my friends or myself can by any possibility lead to that result. I do not desire, we none of us desire, to bolster up industries which under a fair system of competition would fail; what we do desire earnestly and passionately to obtain is to have some system which, while it subserves the great and growing needs of these united kingdoms, may also and at the same time subserve the not less great and growing necessity of binding us closer to those great communities with whose expansion and commercial future our own is so intimately and indisputably bound.

MR. ASQUITH: I will only intervene between the House and a division for a few minutes. The right hon. Gentleman has said we are running away; what are we running away from? There are two propositions before the House; one is the vote of censure on the Government on the attitude they took at the Colonial Conference. On that we challenge the opinion of the House of Commons. The other is the Amendment of my hon. friend the Member for Barnstaple against any form of Colonial preference which involves the protective taxation of food. On that also we challenge the opinion of the House of Commons. The right hon. Gentleman has indulged in a number of eloquent perorations as to the desirability of improving our relations with the Colonies, but I want to bring the matter to a concrete point. Before we take this division, let us clearly understand how we stand. First, as regards preference on the basis of existing duties. It has been pointed out already by my right hon. friend the Under-Secretary for the Colonies that as regards sugar you yourselves have bound us not to enter into a preferential arrangement as to Colonial sugar. Then there is tea. About 97 per cent. of the tea we import comes from the Colonies and dependencies of the Empire. There is nothing to be done there. Now comes the real point, the point to which I wish to direct the attention of the House, the point the right hon. Gentleman ignored. The right hon. Gentleman says you must broaden the basis of taxation, and you must give preference to the Colonies. How is he going to do it? It he going to tax corn? Is he going to tax meat? Is he going to tax butter? Is he going to tax wool? He has no answer to any of those questions. That is all I have to say.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 111; Noes, 404. (Division List No. 283.)

AYES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, RtHn. A.J.(City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G.(Winchester
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James

Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt.Hon.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A. (Worc
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt.Hn.J. (Birminghm
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Dixon-Hartland,SirFred Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan,Robert (Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants,W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gretton, John
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(Bury S.Edmds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.SirJohn H.
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hon.Col.W.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt.Hn. Lt.-Col.A.R
Long,Col.Charles W.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield
Nield, Herbert
O'Niell, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, SirGilbert (Gravesend)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield,SirBerkeleyGeorgeD.)
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford,East.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley,Hon. Arthur(Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W.Mitchell- (Lanark)
Turnour, Viscount
Walker, Col.W.H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson,A.Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen,A.Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker,Joseph A. (Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc,Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn,SirJ.Williams (Devonp'rt
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell,Rt.Hon.Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner,RtHn SirJT(Cheshire)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clarke,C.Goddard(Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats,SirT.Glen (Renfrew,W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J. (S.Pancras,W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow)
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh,S.)

Dewar,SirJ.A.(Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder,SirJohn P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,MajorE.Martin (Walsall
Edwards,Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner,Col.Alan (Hereford, S.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Grove, Archibald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,RtHnSirW.Brampton
Haldane,Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth,Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh.
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey,W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland,Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope,W.Bateman (Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law,Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea,HughCecil (St.Pancras,E.)
Leese,SirJoseph F.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy (Essex,Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield,H.Rendall(Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan,J.Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts., Bassetlaw)
Newnes,Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholson,Charles N(Doncaster
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt.Cecil William
O'Connor, John (Kildare,N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,SirW.D. (Colchester)
Pearson,W.H.M.(Suffolk,Eye)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps,J.Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps,Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price,C.E.(Edinburgh,Central)
Price,Robert John(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards,T.F.(Wolverhampt'n
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.

Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, W Dudley (Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hn. C. H. W. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Proposed words added.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I wish to ask whether this can be inserted in the journals of the House as having been carried *nemine contradicente.*

*MR. SPEAKER: That point will arise on the main question being put.

Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not know whether I am in order in moving that this be entered in the journals of the House as having been passed *nemine contradicente.*

*MR. SPEAKER: I heard one or two hon. Members say "No."

Resolved, That, in the opinion of this House, the permanent unity of the British Empire will not be secured through a system of preferential duties based upon the protective taxation of food.

SUGAR.

Return ordered, "showing, with regard to London, Paris, and Berlin, the price of Sugar and the Duty levied thereon on the 1st day of March, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906, and 1907 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 132, of Session 1906)."—(*Mr. Pike Pease.*)

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the County of Kilkenny (South Kilkenny Division), in the room of James O'Mara, esquire (Chiltern Hundreds).—(*Captain Donelan*).

Adjourned at twenty-nine minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 16*th July*, 1907.

Godfrey Charles Baron Tredegar having been created Viscount Tredegar of Tredegar, in the county of Monmouth—Was (in the usual manner) introduced.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2.) Bill [H.L]—(Unopposed Orders). Reported, with Amendments.

Sunderland Corporation Bill, London County Council (Money) Bill, Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill, Richmond (Surrey) Electricity Supply Bill, North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill. Reported, with Amendments.

Armagh Urban District Council Bill, Collooney, Ballina, and Belmullet Railways and Piers Bill. The King's consent signified; and Bills reported, with Amendments.

London and North-Western Railway Bill. Read 3^a, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

Worthing Gas Bill. Read 3^a, with the Amendments; and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Devonport Corporation Bill [H.L.], Tees Valley Water Consolidation Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments: The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Leeds Corporation Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2.) Bill [H.L.]. Re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House Tomorrow.

Kendal Corporation Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

PETITIONS.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

Petition in favour of legalisation of, of Provost, &c., of Dunfermline; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3858. Persia (Bunder Abbas and Lingah).

TREATY SERIES, NO. 19. (1907).

Agreement between the United Kingdom and Norway respecting the mutual surrender of fugitive criminals; signed at Christiania, 18th February. 1907.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

EAST INDIA (EXAMINATIONS FOR THE CIVIL SERVICE).

Regulations for admission to the Indian Civil Service, alteration to paragraph 9.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.

First Report by the President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries as a Commissioner of Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues by virtue of the Crown Lands Act, 1906.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

ADVERTISEMENTS REGULATION BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee with further Amendments: The Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the Whole House and by the Standing Committee to be received To-morrow; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 113.)

BRITISH NORTH AMERICA BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order).

[The Earl of ONSLOW in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of ELGIN): My Lords, the first is a small Amendment

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

in order to preserve the rights of certain provinces under the existing law. They are now entitled to receive the highest grant to which their population has ever entitled them although the population itself may decrease. The only practical question arises in Prince Edward Island. There the population at one time was 94,000; it rose to 110,000 and receded to 103,000, but the grant continued throughout. I therefore beg to move that these words be here inserted.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 4, at the beginning of paragraph (*b*) to insert the words 'subject to the special provisions of this Act as to the provinces of British Columbia and Prince Edward Island.'"—(*The Earl of Elgin.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

* THE EARL OF ELGIN then moved the insertion of a new subsection to Clause 1.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 38, after the word 'substituted' to insert the following new subsection:—'(8) In the case of the provinces of British Columbia and Prince Edward Island, the amount paid on account of the grant payable per head of the population to the provinces under this Act shall not at any time be less than the amount of the corresponding grant payable at the commencement of this Act; and if it is found on any decennial census that the population of the province has decreased since the last decennial census, the amount paid on account of the grant shall not be decreased below the amount then payable, notwithstanding the decrease of the population.'"—(*The Earl of Elgin.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Schedule:—

* THE EARL OF ELGIN: My Lords, the Schedule which I now move to insert is to meet the desire of the Dominion Government that the Address in which they requested His Majesty to bring in this Imperial Act should appear in its full terms. We had to inform them that it was not possible to incorporate the words of the Address in the text of the Bill, which we maintain unaltered; but we think it is possible to insert the Address in full as a Schedule. In order that that may be done we have also to insert a Preamble, which I will move afterwards. In the meantime I beg to move the insertion of the Schedule.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, to insert as a schedule:—'Schedule. To the King's Most Excellent Majesty. Most Gracious Sovereign, We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Senate and Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty for the purpose of representing that it is expedient to amend the scale of payments authorised under Section 118 of the Acts of the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, commonly called the British North America Act, 1867, or by or under any terms or conditions upon which any other provinces were admitted to the Union, to be made by Canada to the several provinces of the Dominion for the support of their Governments and Legislatures by providing that—A. Instead of the amounts now payable, the sums hereafter payable yearly by Canada to the several provinces for the support of their Governments and Legislatures be according to population, and as follows: (*a*) Where the population of the province is under 150,000, $100,000; (*b*) Where the population of the province is 150,000, but does not exceed 200,000, $150,000; (*c*) Where the population of the province is 200,000, but does not exceed 400,000, $180,000: (*d*) Where the population of the province is 400,000, but does not exceed 800,000, $190,000; (*e*) Where the population of the province is 800,000, but does not exceed 1,500,000, $220,000; (*f*) Where the population of the province exceeds 1,500,000, $240,000. B. Instead of an annual grant per head of population now allowed, the annual payment hereafter be at the same rate of eighty cents per head, but on the population of each province, as ascertained from time to time by the last decennial census, or in the case of the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta respectively, by the last quinquennial census or statutory estimate, until such population exceeds 2,500,000, and at the rate of sixty cents per head for so much of said population as may exceed 2,500,000. C. An additional allowance to the extent of one hundred thousand dollars annually be paid for ten years to the province of British Columbia. D. Nothing herein contained shall in any way supersede or affect the terms special to any particular province upon which such province became part of the Dominion of Canada, or the right of any province to the payment of any special grant heretofore made by the Parliament of Canada to any province for any special purpose in such grant expressed. We pray that Your Majesty may be graciously pleased to cause a measure to be laid before the Imperial Parliament at its present session repealing the provisions of Section 118 of the British North America Act, 1867, aforesaid, and substituting therefor the scale of payments above set forth which shall be a final and unalterable settlement of the amounts to be paid yearly to the several provinces of the Dominion for their local purposes, and the support of their Governments and Legislatures. Such grants shall be paid half-yearly in advance to each province, but the Government of Canada shall deduct from such grants as against any province all sums chargeable as interest on the public debt of that province in excess of the several amounts stipulated in the said Act. All of which we humbly pray Your Majesty to take into your favourable and gracious consideration.

'(Signed) R. DANDURAND,
Speaker of the Senate.

'(Signed) R. F. SUTHERLAND,
Speaker of the House of Commons.

'Senate and House of Commons,
Ottawa, Canada,
26th April, 1907.'"

—(*The Earl of Elgin.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Preamble :—

THE EARL OF ELGIN : I beg to move the insertion of the Preamble which stands on the Paper.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, to insert as a premable to the Bill the words 'Whereas an address has been presented to His Majesty by the Senate and Commons of Canada in the terms set forth in the Schedule to this Act.'"—(*The Earl of Elgin.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Consequential Amendment agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow; and Bill to be printed as Amended. (No. 114.)

LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS BILL.

Report of Amendments received.

THE EARL OF GRANARD moved to delete from Clause 3 the words—

"'Prescribed' means prescribed by rules made in pursuance of this Act.'"

The word "prescribed" did not appear anywhere else in the Bill and the interpretation was therefore unnecessary.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 16, to leave out from the word 'Act' to the end of the clause."—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

Consequential Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF GRANARD explained that the next Amendment was consequential on an Amendment which had been inserted on the Motion of Lord Avebury.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 11, to leave out from the word "firm" to the end of subsection (3) and to insert the words 'up to the amount so drawn out or 'received back.'"—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF GRANARD moved to omit from Clause 4, subsection (4)—

"(4) The firm name must contain the words 'limited firm' as the last words in the name."

The omission of this subsection had been very carefully considered by the Board of Trade. They had approached business experts in the matter, and these experts were of opinion that if the provision remained in the Bill a great many of its effects would be destroyed. The words "limited firm" had no place in the laws of foreign countries where the system of limited partnerships was in force. He understood that Lord Avebury was in favour of the Amendment.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, lines 15 and 16, to leave out subsection (4)."—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

LORD AVEBURY said he had also done what he could to ascertain the opinion of the commercial community, and he confirmed what the noble Earl had said. He mentioned that the subsection was not in the Bill as drafted by the Chambers of Commerce or as passed by their Lordships last year. He agreed that the Bill would be greatly improved by the omission of these words.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF GRANARD said it seemed necessary to declare what the procedure should be after the Court had made a winding-up order against a limited partner, and the simplest procedure was that of the Acts relating to the winding-up of companies. The object of his next Amendment was to secure this.

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 2, after '1900' to insert the words 'and the provisions of those Acts relating to the winding-up of companies by the Court and of the rules made thereunder (including provisions as to fees) shall, subject to such modifications (if any) as the Lord Chancellor, with the concurrence of the President of the Board of Trade, may by rules provide, apply to the winding-up by the Court of limited partnerships, with the substitution of general partners for directors."—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Consequential Amendments agreed to.

THE EARL OF GRANARD moved to amend Clause 9 by requiring that a statement signed by the firm specifying the nature of the change should be forwarded if, during the continuance of a limited partnership, any change were made or occurred in the term "or character" of the partnership. He said it was obviously desirable that changes in the character of a partnership should also be registered.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 10, after the word 'term' to insert the words 'or character."—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Consequential Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF GRANARD explained that the new paragraph which he proposed to insert in Clause 9 was necessary in the event of a general partner becoming a limited partner, or *vice versa*.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 12, after the word 'partner' to insert '(*g*) the liability of any partner by reason of his becoming a limited instead of a general partner or a general instead of a limited partner.'"—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF GRANARD moved to amend subsection (2) of Clause 9—

"(2) If default is made in compliance with the requirements of this section each of the partners shall on conviction under the Summary Jurisdiction Acts be liable to a fine not exceeding £1 for each day during which the default continues,"

by inserting before the word "partners" the word "general." The object of the Amendment was to make it quite clear that the penalty provision was only applicable to general partners.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 18, after the first 'the' to insert the word 'general.'"—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF GRANARD moved to leave out Clause 10 (publication of name of limited partnership), which had been rendered unnecessary by a previous Amendment.

Amendment moved—

"To leave out Clause 10."—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendments agreed to.

THE EARL OF GRANARD moved the insertion of a new Clause 10, the object of which was, he said, to safeguard persons dealing with a limited partnership and to bring to their knowledge any change in the *status* of the partners.

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 9 to insert the following new clause:—'(1) Notice of any arrangement or transaction under which any person will cease to be a general partner in any firm and will become a limited partner in that firm, or under which the share of a limited partner in a firm will be assigned to any person, shall be forthwith advertised in the *Gazette*, and until notice of the arrangement or transaction is so advertised, the arrangement or transaction shall, for the purposes of this Act, be deemed to be of no effect. (2) For the purposes of this section, the expression 'the *Gazette*' means—In the case of a limited partnership registered in England, the London *Gazette*; in the case of a limited partnership registered in Scotland, the Edinburgh *Gazette*; in the case of a limited partnership registered in Ireland, the Dublin *Gazette*.'"—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill to be read 3^a on Thursday next; and to be printed as amended. (No. 115.)

QUALIFICATION OF WOMEN (COUNTY AND BOROUGH COUNCILS) BILL [H.L.].

Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3^a on Tuesday next.

IMPORTED WATCH-CASES BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order). Bill reported without amendment, and re-committed to the Standing Committee.

FIJI.

*LORD STANMORE rose to move for any correspondence between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Governor of Fiji respecting the sale of certain lands in the Provinces of Rewa and Naitasiri. The noble Lord said: My Lords, I do not often trespass on your Lordships' time, and I hope that may be a plea for indulgence if I now ask your attention for a few moments to matters which have occurred a great distance off, and are, perhaps, not likely to attract very general interest. Yet they are not without some importance, for they affect, as I believe, our national honour on the one hand, and the existence or destruction of the people of the Fijian Islands on the other.

I wish to call attention to two different points. First, I wish to say a few words with regard to the cases specially referred to in my Notice; and, secondly—and this is of far more importance—to ask your attention to the general principles which seem to have guided the action of the local government in this matter and caused their reversal of the policy which it has hitherto been deemed expedient to pursue. Before I enter into any description of the two cases of sale of land mentioned in my Notice, it is necessary that I should give some explanation of the general system of land tenure in Fiji. Taken generally, and allowing for exceptions which occur here and there, the native ownership of all lands in the Fijian Islands is communal. Putting on one side a few exceptional cases, there is nothing like individual property, except as regards the dwelling-house and what in England we should call its curtilage. The fields, which are the property of the village, are portioned out from time to time to cultivators, and the waste belonging to it is common to the whole commune.

When it came to be considered what steps were to be taken to ensure the natives in the full possession of their rights without entirely blocking the progress of settlement by white planters, it was decided, after much consideration, that while the Government should be allowed for public purposes, strictly defined, to take land, no other native land should be sold, but that all transactions involving a change of occupation should bear the character of a lease. It might be a lease for a period sufficiently long to confer all the essentials of proprietorship, but still which would not involve the loss of the actual proprietary right in the natives themselves. If sale were made as against a certain price paid down to those who were then in occupation of the land, nothing would be ensured to future generations. Now the tenure of the land in Fiji, as I have said, is communal; that is to say, those who occupy it at any given time have only a life interest in it. It was thought expedient that by the device of a lease there should always be some money coming to the commune as long as the lease lasted, and that it should not be whittled and made away with by being given in a lump sum once for all to those who really had no right to dispose of the property, and who possessed only a life interest in it.

With that preface I now come to the cases which have induced me to bring the matter before the House on this occasion. In pursuance of the policy I have indicated and of the enactments made in accordance with it, a large tract of land in the Province of Naitasiri was leased to an Australian sugar company for a considerable number of years at a rent of £415 a year. Last year overtures were made to the Government and to the native proprietors to commute the lease and turn it into a sale. It was proposed that a sum amounting to about half the rent which was still accruing should be paid, but this payment was not only to extinguish the future rent, but also to carry with it the proprietorship of the land afterwards. That at the first blush would not seem to be a very equitable settlement. In the first place, there were seven years of the lease to run, the rent for which was worth altogether over £2,800, and that was to be given up for a lump sum of £1,500, thereby losing to the commune for the future a large amount of money and at the same time depriving them of any future interest in the land, apparently without compensation. But when a

Fijian or any other person in that particular state of civilisation is deprived of the land he has nothing to look to, there is nothing before him but a life of labour perhaps on the very estates which were once partly his own.

The second case that has aroused my attention is one in the Province of Rewa. Either the same or some other Australian sugar company is desirous of obtaining the greater part of the delta of Rewa for sugar cultivation. It is one of the most populous parts of Fiji. In this case the company did not ask for a sale but for a lease of ninety-nine years, to which in principle there can be no objection; but, in the first place, they offered an exceedingly low rent, and, in the second place, they did not take into account whether or not the inhabitants of these villages and the proprietors of these lands were willing to enter into the lease. Almost unanimously the different villages and and communities concerned absolutely refused to have anything to do with the lease. They were exposed to a great deal of pressure and temptation in the way of bribes — I do not mean bribes in the ordinary sense to individuals, but by the offer of a large sum of money to the present generation —but they stoutly refused, and their refusal was sustained by many persons of European descent in the Colony who had knowledge of the proceedings. The natives being unwilling to lease, other methods were adopted. A new Ordinance was brought into the Legislative Council, which provided that (I am quoting from the official *Royal Gazette*)—

> "The expression 'public purposes' shall be deemed to include any undertaking, proposal, or policy which may appear to the Governor in Council desirable as directly or indirectly benefiting the Colony."

*THE EARL OF ELGIN: Will the noble Lord give me the date of that Ordinance?

*LORD STANMORE: The date, I am sorry to say, has been cut off, but must have been about the close of last year. It is quite clear that under an Ordinance like that the natives might be deprived of the whole of their land at any time. It would only be necessary for the proposal to be thought to be directly or indirectly of benefit to the Colony. There are a vast number of settlers in Fiji who conscientiously entertain the opinion that it would be largely for the benefit of the Colony if every native occupation ceased to exist. In the first place, there is a desire to obtain the land for useful purposes—a very fair and legitimate wish, and which, under the leasing system, I have no objection to being carried out to the full; but there is also a wish on the part of a good many people to get rid of native ownership of land, because the natives would then be obliged to sell their labour instead of working on their own land. There are a great many settlers in Fiji who do not hold that view, but nevertheless a very large proportion do so. The late Hon. James Mason, a large planter and a Member of the Legislative Council, met me one day, and, as usual, grumbled at the state of things generally and the state of planting. I said to him, "I have just been moving about all through the Colony. It seems to me that everywhere there is more prosperity than there was two years ago. In every native village I visit I see there are new houses and better houses and extended cultivation. I see the people looking well fed and happy. There are more pigs and more poultry, and I think the people are much better off than they were." His reply was, "Yes, sir; of course they are better off, and they are much better off, but we do not want them to be better off; we want them to be ill off. When they are ill off they will come and work for us, but when they are well off they will not." I took these words down at the time, and I have often thought of them since. They are an index of the antipathy which is displayed on the part of many settlers to native occupation of land.

There may be very good explanations for both of the transactions referred to in my Notice. I made remarks upon them in no hostile spirit either to the Colonial Office or the Governor of the Colony. I know that my noble friend who at present presides over the Colonial Office is a man who has at heart in the truest and fullest sense native interests everywhere, and I have every reason to believe that the Governor, who has had great experience, is also very well disposed to native interests. But, after all, Governors certainly, and perhaps even the Colonial Office, are not altogether infallible, and it is sometimes the case that people with the very best intentions make grave mistakes. Indeed, I think that in matters of this sort very often as much harm, if not even more harm, is done by well-intentioned but injudicious meddling as is done by actual hostility. As I have said these cases may admit of good explanations, but *à priori* they do look something like sharp practice.

But what is far more important, and what I specially wish to ask your Lordships' attention to, is the principle by which this action seems to have been directed. It is the substitution of sale for lease. The policy that the land should remain with the natives in perpetuity but might be leased was not a fad of mine. It was certainly my policy, but it was also that of the very able men who have succeeded me in the Government of Fiji, of Sir William Des Vœux, of Sir Charles Mitchell, and of Sir John Murston, and it was gone into carefully and approved by successive Secretaries of State. Lord Kimberley, Lord Carnarvon, Lord St. Aldwyn, and Lord Derby in a most emphatic manner approved that policy—a policy which I believe to be absolutely essential to the very existence of the Fijian, which is bound up with the land. In one of the cases to which I have referred there was a sort of compensation offered. It was that those who were displaced should have two acres of land allotted to them. There is something of the air of "three acres and a cow" about that. It would seem as if this might be a very proper allowance for a poor Fijian, but two acres of land independently is not of the slightest use to him. You might as well give him two acres of white paper; it is of no use to him. The property is communal and so is the cultivation and that on which the cultivation depends, irrigation. In all large Fijian towns there is an elaborate system of irrigation. It is carried on by the commune, who have made the canals and the junctions to the different fields by which the water supply is regulated, and it is impossible for an unfortunate Fijian to cultivate a couple of acres if they are unirrigated nor can he irrigate them himself. Moreover, two acres are not sufficient for the sort of crops they raise. There are no butchers' and bakers' shops in the country districts of Fiji, and each man has to provide entirely for his family. That requires space, especially as the crops which they raise, and on which they are entirely dependent for food, require a lot of ground and being of an exhausting nature render it necessary that the land should from time to time be left fallow.

Then, again, I believe it to be an injustice to take these lands. We have no more right to take communal land in Fiji, except under particular circumstances, than we have to take the lands of any of your Lordships. Public necessity may over-ride that in the one case as in the other, but, failing public necessity, those lands should remain in the possession of those who hold them. All who are acquainted with the Fijian race know perfectly well that if you separate them from the land the race will die out, and that would be a violation of the express conditions on which alone we took possession of the Fijian Islands. We told the natives that we had come to protect them against the lawlessness of the white settlers; we told them that their lands should be kept to them inviolate; we told them that their customs and laws, so far as they were not absolutely objectionable and immoral, should be maintained, and to that we are pledged by despatches without number from successive Secretaries of State, and in speeches, equally without number, of successive Governors; and what is more important than all, by the solemn word of Her late Majesty the Queen. On two separate occasions Her late Majesty did me the honour to convey to me her commands from her own lips that I was to tell the Fijian people that their lands were theirs and should never be taken from them. I told them so on the authority of our Sovereign, and I do trust that that pledge then given will be maintained.

I have no feeling against the authorities in Fiji. I believe the Governor to be well disposed towards the native races, but I do think he somewhat misunderstands the position in which he has only recently been placed. I think so the more from a remarkable utterance which he made to a large meeting of natives. He told them that he would have no difficulty in governing them for he had had experience for several years of a community just like their own. He meant the wild savages of British Guiana, and I hold that it is an insult to the Fijian people to make such a comparison. There is hardly a Fijian who cannot read and write and who is not comfortably housed, and that cannot be said of the Guiana Indians. My noble friend has been Governor-General of India, and will perfectly understand me when I say that it is much as if a commissioner appointed to some well-to-do district in Bengal were to tell the people he knew all about them because he had served twenty years among the Bheels or Khonds. That makes me think that the Governor has not, or at least had not at that time, gained a full grasp of the work that lay before him. Another reason for thinking so is that in a letter which I have seen from him with regard to complaints which have been made, in which he says he considers that the protection which the natives have received was very much overdone and is not necessary now that they are adolescent, and that if it had not been for all the protection afforded to them they would be entitled now to what he calls the full rights of British subjects. By that he means that they might now be put on exactly the same level with all other folk in the Colony.

I suppose most of your Lordships have read an amusing skit called "Vice versa," in which are portrayed the results of a boy of fourteen and a respectable city merchant of sixty changing identities: what the boy of fourteen does as a city merchant may be imagined better than described. That is exactly what would come to pass by putting the Fijian in a position to deal with his white neighbour without any protection whatever. The Fijian will make any sacrifice, however improvident, to indulge a momentary want, just as children do; and unless the protection of the State which has hitherto been afforded to them is continued I see perfectly clearly what the result will be. It will mean an end of the Fijian race. The passionate clinging of the Fijian to the land is a fact which it would be wrong and indeed dangerous to ignore. My noble friend knows very well what would be the effect of any similar meddlings with the land tenures of India.

I know that in what I have said I have been speaking the sentiments of others who have governed that Colony. I myself am one of the parties interested, for I am a Fijian landowner. Her late Majesty was graciously pleased, when I left Fiji, to allow me to accept a gift from the Fijian people of two small islands of no commercial value, but the possession of which was sufficient to give me the title of a *turaga taukei*—a landowning chief in the country. It is, therefore, as one of them, and as their representative, that I come before your Lordships to ask you to give some attention to their rights, and what I fear may be their wrongs.

Moved, That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty for any correspondence between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Governor of Fiji respecting the sale of certain lands in the Provinces of Rewa and Naitasiri.—(*The Lord Stanmore.*)

*THE EARL OF ELGIN: My Lords, I am sure your Lordships will acknowledge that the noble Lord has every right to speak as the representative of Fiji, and to bring before the House any subject in which he thinks the people of those islands have been wronged; but my difficulty in answering him is that, though I have devoted some time to a study of the subjects involved in the Question, I have had no little difficulty in informing myself accurately on some of the points, in regard to which perhaps the noble Lord will give me some further explanation privately. As to one of the sales—that in Rewa—I cannot speak definitely; and with regard to the Ordinance which was quoted, if it was passed last year, as the noble Lord stated, it ought to have been sent home for sanction, but I cannot find it among my Papers.

*LORD STANMORE: I did not say the Ordinance had been passed. What I quoted from was the draft of the Ordinance. I know it was inserted in the *Gazette* as coming before the Legislative Council, but whether wiser counsels prevailed and it was withdrawn I do not know.

*THE EARL OF ELGIN: I will inquire into it. With regard to the other case—that in Naitasiri—I can give some particulars. The land, we are told by the noble Lord, was originally let to a sugar company at a rental of £415, and the price for which it was to be sold was £1,500. It is quite true that the land was originally let to a sugar company for £415 a year, but they declined to renew the lease on the ground that the land was exhausted. The land was valued by two competent persons at not more than £200 a year, and in those circumstances the selling price assumes a different aspect. That is the actual state of the matter with regard to that transaction.

As to the principle underlying the sales, there can be no doubt whatever that under the Treaty by which we assumed the protection of Fiji, it was laid down in the fourth clause that the sole proprietary of all lands not shown to be then alienated, or not then in the actual use or occupation of some chief or tribe, or not actually required for the future support and maintenance of some chief or tribe should vest in Her Majesty, her heirs and successors. I have not been able to trace any later enactment altering that state of the law; but the explanation may possibly be found in the custom of communal property. Large tracts may be nominally the property of a tribe and not be in the ordinary sense under cultivation. But even in such cases, in the event of the tribe ceasing to exist, the ownership of the land reverts to the Crown. In 1875 Lord Carnarvon distinctly declared that the whole of the land in Fiji belonged to the Crown, and in 1893 the chiefs met and resolved that the control of the land ought to be with the Government. It is clear that there are powers over the land possessed by the Government which the Governor is bound to exercise, in the interests of the natives of course.

In 1905 an Ordinance was passed which did permit sales to take place, but only under stringent regulations, the Governor being empowered to refuse his consent if the sale seemed improper, if the land were necessary for the maintenance of any person, or if the price to be paid was inequitable. Under the Ordinance of 1905 the responsibility of the Governor remained under the former provisions for securing the welfare of the native population, but in any case in which he thought it necessary to exercise his discretion and to permit sale he was bound by very distinct and definite provisions to see to the interests of the native population in the direction in which the noble Lord desires.

I should like to point out that the provisions for dealing with land in Fiji are entirely different from those in other Colonies of the Empire. In other Colonies we reserve land for the natives necessary to their maintenance, and the Crown is permitted to dispose of the surplus lands to those whom the authorities consider to be most likely to be good settlers and to promote the prosperity of the Colony as a whole. In Fiji there is ample room for the introduction of settlers. The land acreage is 4,800,000 acres and it is estimated that 4,250,000 acres are uncultivated. In addition to that the population of Fiji has decreased from 140,000 in the time of the noble Lord to 86,000 now. There is thus a large amount of land available in Fiji, and the native population is not adequate to cultivate the whole of it. There is, therefore, no danger whatever of the native population being deprived of those acres which the noble Lord thinks are necessary for their existence. It is the duty of the local Government and of the Governor to take what steps they reasonably can to promote the settlement of the Islands, with a view to increasing their population and prosperity. Having said that, I wish to assure the noble Lord that I do not differ from him in a distinct preference for leases rather than sales. I do not think there is any real difference of opinion on that point. I should like to see leases taken in every case in which it is possible, and I may tell the noble Lord that there are several portions of land which have been leased of late on conditions which he would approve. For instance, I find in a recent letter describing some considerable settlements in one district that a condition was imposed by the Governor that no lease should extend beyond ninety-nine years from August, 1906. The Ordinance does provide for the Governor allowing a sale under strict rules limiting his discretion, should occasion render it desirable; and while I would be quite willing to draw the Governor's attention to the necessity for observing very strict rules in exercising his powers under the Ordinance, I think the provision is one that ought to be maintained. I have in preparation some Papers which, I think, will satisfy my noble friend.

* LORD STANMORE: I propose to take advantage of the invitation of my noble friend to communicate with him privately on some of the points on which I think he is mistaken. But I should like to say that the belief among the natives that they are likely to be deprived of their land is creating a great deal of feeling of a serious character, which may, if something is not done to reassure them, lead to very serious consequences.

On Question, Motion agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

MOTOR CAR LEGISLATION.

EARL RUSSELL rose to ask His Majesty's Government what consideration had been given to the Report of the Royal Commission on Motor Cars, and when it was their intention to introduce fresh motor legislation. The noble Earl said: My Lords, in 1905, a very important and influential Royal Commission was appointed to consider the subject of motor cars, and what legislation was desirable when the Act at that time existing, and which was limited to three years, expired. That Commission held a great many sittings and examined a great many witnesses; it was extremely painstaking in its work, and presented a very carefully considered and somewhat voluminous Report. Their Report was, I think, presented almost exactly twelve months ago, and the object of the Commission was stated at the time of its appointment to be to advise His Majesty's Government for the time being as to what fresh legislation was necessary when the existing Act expired. The Motor Car Act of 1903 was limited to a term of three years from 1st January, 1904, and would, therefore, in the ordinary course, have expired on 1st January, this year. It is at present continued by having been inserted in the Expiring Laws Continuance Act.

Questions were asked during the last session as to what legislation, if any, was proposed, and His Majesty's Government said, very reasonably, that as the Report was presented in August, it was obvious that there was no time to consider the Report or to do anything in that session. I notice that there have been several Questions in another place addressed to the President of the Local Government Board as to whether legislation would take place this year, and for some time the reply was to the effect that he had not decided and could not make any announcement; but it has now been definitely stated that there will be no legislation this year. I think I may say that motorists as a whole would feel that it is more desirable that legislation should be postponed for another year than that it should be introduced at the fag end of the session. The present Act suffers from having been passed in the month of August and in a great deal of haste. Amendments were made in another place of a substantial character, which could not receive any discussion at all in your Lordships' House owing to want of time.

Whenever legislation is introduced I hope it will be introduced quite early in the session, so that the proposals may be examined and considered at leisure. I should be glad to extract from His Majesty's Government some intimation as to what consideration has been given to the Report of the Royal Commission. I assume, of course, that it has been carefully considered by the Department concerned, and I should be glad to know whether it is proposed to found fresh legislation upon it, and whether it is proposed to introduce it at some time during next session. There is always the danger when an Act is passed temporarily that it may be continued, by inclusion in the Expired Laws Continuance Act, until it becomes permanent. Against that I think we should be entitled to protest. It is obviously convenient for the Department and the officials concerned, but I hope that policy will not be adopted in this case, and that at some time or another fresh legislation will be introduced.

I have been impelled to put this Question on the Paper on account of a statement which was made in the other House. There is a maxim that it is well to let sleeping dogs lie, and it may be thought that, unfair to motorists as the existing legislation is, and inequitably as it is enforced in many cases, it is better to let things remain as they are. But I was very much startled by a statement of the

Chancellor of the Exchequer to the effect that he had decided, at some future date, to impose an additional tax on motor-cars. It is true that one of the recommendations of the Royal Commission was that such additional tax should be imposed, but this was only a portion of the scheme of other recommendations, one of which is that the artificial speed limit should be abolished. I hope it is not the intention of His Majesty's Government to legislate piecemeal on this subject, and gradually to impose upon motorists any additional disabilities which may be suggested in the Report of the Royal Commission and leave untouched the other important matters dealt with.

It appears to be a tempting thing sometimes to tax motor-cars, but I have not been able to understand why that particular vehicle should be more subject to taxation than other vehicles. Mr. Asquith, in his Budget speech, said he thought it was a tax which was in every way desirable, because it was a tax on a luxury which was apt to degenerate into a nuisance. There may be different opinions as to its being a nuisance, but it is not the case that a large proportion of motor-cars in use are of the nature of a luxury. That is not the purposes for which motor-cars are used nowadays. Motor-cars have emerged from the stage of being the playthings of the rich and have become the ordinary means by which ordinary people go from place to place about their business. I do not, however, deny that they are also used for purposes of pleasure. When the system of toll gates was abolished in this country I understood that the principle was then enunciated that it was to the advantage of the community that the roads should be supported by the community as a whole and their maintenance should become a charge on the rates. I do not know whether that principle is to be departed from by taxing one vehicle in preference to another.

I regard the abolition of the speed limit as the most important recommendation of the Royal Commission. The Motor-car Act of 1903, as introduced into this House and assented to by your Lordships, contained no provision for an artificial speed limit, but that provision was inserted in another place. There are many objections of the most serious character to an artificial speed limit quite apart from the objection of the motorist himself. One objection is that it makes into a crime an act which may not be criminal or anti-social in its character. It is impossible for anyone to say that it is always and in all places an anti-social act to go over twenty miles an hour. What it is possible to say and what ought to be emphasised, though it is not emphasised now, is that it is an anti-social act, and should be a criminal act, to drive in such a way as to endanger any other human being. The way in which the artificial speed limit is enforced now tends to obscure that. The home counties have been specially disgraced by the manner in which the Motor-car Act has been administered. Attention is not directed to that which I think your Lordships all agree is of importance—the safety of the public. Policemen are not stationed in the villages where there are people about who might be in danger, but are hidden in hedges or ditches by the side of the most open roads in the country. Motorists may drive through villages in any way they like. In other counties the road is left alone in the matter of the police traps, but the villages are guarded. This state of things is not confined so much as it used to be to the home counties. It has been found that motor trapping is a very profitable employment. East Sussex has gone in for an elaborate electric timing apparatus, which has earned its original cost many times over; and this system of trapping is now being extended all over the country. The result is that careful and considerate motorists are constantly being trapped, and become indistinguishable from the reckless and careless motorists whose licences ought to be taken away. It is a very regrettable thing that this enactment, which has been condemned by a Royal Commission who went very carefully into the matter, should be utilised by the police authorities throughout the country for the creation of an enormous number of these artificial crimes, and I hope His Majesty's Government will recognise that they cannot hold their hand indefinitely, and will at some time or another amend the existing law and place it on a rational footing.

*LORD MONTAGU OF BEAULIEU: My Lords, I rise to support the appeal which the noble Earl opposite has made that the Government should not altogether overlook the terms of the Report of the Royal Commission. At the same time I think there is a very large body of opinion in favour of letting sleeping dogs lie, as the noble Earl expressed it, rather than endeavouring to secure fresh legislation on the subject at present. I am aware that the Royal Commission reported in favour of the abolition of the artificial speed limit, but we have to consider, not the abstract right and wrong of the recommendations of the Royal Commission, but whether the House of Commons as at present constituted would pass any new legislation in which a speed limit was absent. I am inclined to think that new legislation might be in the direction of making the speed limit twenty-five or thirty miles an hour instead of twenty, but, on the other hand, the penalties for all kinds of offences would be very largely increased, and there might be other points in the new legislation which would operate adversely to motorists. I venture to think that motoring is becoming less unpopular every day, and if we could only get rid of the dust nuisance a great deal of the unpopularity still remaining would be removed.

I am entirely in sympathy with what the noble Earl said with regard to police traps. In my opinion they are manifestly absurd as a protection to the public, and they are used in many counties merely as a means of extracting money from the passing traveller in a way which reminds one of the highwaymen of the Middle Ages. As to the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to which the noble Earl referred, I do think it would be grossly unjust that fresh taxation should be put on motor-cars, and that that should be done before many other important questions, such as, for instance, the constitution of a central authority for roads, are dealt with. I hope the Government will be able between now and next session to think out a measure which, without imposing further taxation on motor-cars, will deal with the other portions of the Commission's Report. So far as motorists generally are concerned I am confident that they will view this matter entirely free from party bias, and would willingly accept even more onerous conditions so long as there was fairness and justice in new legislation, and they were dealt with in a statesmanlike manner. I should also like to join in the appeal of the noble Earl that when legislation is introduced it should not be brought in in the dog days. Not only is that a bad time for the introduction of any legislation, but it is more so in the case of motor-cars, as it is just at that season that the dust nuisance is at its greatest. I hope His Majesty's Government will be able to give us some information in reply to the question of the noble Earl.

*LORD ALLENDALE: My Lords, my noble friend who raised this question, and the noble Lord who has just sat down, have to some extent, I venture to think, answered their own inquiries. His Majesty's Government fully recognise the importance of this matter, and have not lost sight of it. As your Lordships have been reminded by Lord Russell, the Report of the Royal Commission was issued at the end of last session, just twelve months ago, and it was obviously impossible at that period to introduce legislation on the subject. The Motorcar Act of 1903 was therefore included in the Expiring Laws Continuance Act and remains in force until December next. I can assure the noble Earl who raised this question that it is not the intention of His Majesty's Government to continue this course indefinitely, although they will have to include the Act in the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill again this session.

Your Lordships will probably agree with me that the most important points in connection with motor-cars dealt with by the Royal Commission were (1) the codification of the law with regard to all mechanically-propelled vehicles on highways; (2) the allocation of the proceeds of taxation for the purposes of improving highways; (3) the question of speed-limit, which some people may consider the most important of all. As to what the Chancellor of the Exchequer may have in view I have no notion, and we shall have to wait another year before we know what his proposals are. The question of the speed limit is no doubt the *crux* on which legislation will turn, and, although I do not propose to follow the noble Lords into that, I agree with a great deal of what they have said with regard to it. But there is considerable divergence of opinion in the country, and it should not be forgotten that the Commissioners were not entirely unanimous on this question. It therefore behoves His Majesty's Government to walk warily. If legislation were attempted on the lines suggested in the Report, it would embrace, not only the speed limit, but a variety of other points which would involve a considerable amount of discussion; and having regard to the state of public business, the Government are unable to introduce a Bill dealing with the question this year. But His Majesty's Government feel that the delay in legislation is not altogether to be regretted. The use of motor-cars is increasing, and it would be rash and unwise to assume that it has yet reached its full development. The postponement of legislation, therefore, gives a great chance of a lasting and satisfactory settlement in the light of further experience.

THE MARQUESS OF **LONDONDERRY**: My Lords, speaking as one having practical experience of motor-cars, I have no fault to find with the Answer which has just been given on behalf of His Majesty's Government. Undoubtedly the question of a speed limit is one on which it is extremely difficult to legislate. The question of confining motorists to twenty miles an hour is, to my mind, equally dangerous to the public, for a low speed is far more dangerous in a crowded town than a speed of fifty or sixty miles an hour is in open country, and in those places where these useless police traps are mostly located. Again, it should be remembered that motor-cars are not now as unpopular as they once were. When they were first introduced into this country they were generally detested by the agricultural classes, and this was due to the fact that a great number of the chauffeurs came from abroad, where there was no speed limit; and they drove their cars regardless of the discomfort which they caused to other people who used the roads. That has now been very much altered. We now have a different class of drivers, and they do consider the comfort and welfare of others. Motor-cars have come to stay, and they are owned by a very large number of people. Moreover, the working and construction of motor-cars gives a large amount of employment. Therefore, to my mind nothing should be done that would be detrimental to the motor-car industry. With regard to the use of the roads by motor-cars, I should like to see adopted the suggestion which was made by a friend of mine in the other House, who advocated a tariff on motor-cars of £1 or 10s. per horse-power. The owners would not feel the extra expense; and the very large sum which would be derived from the tariff should be placed at the disposal of some Government Department to be distributed for the maintenance of roads, so that dust would not accumulate, or for the compensation of those who suffered inconvenience from motor-cars.

DIVORCE IN IRELAND.

EARL **RUSSELL** rose to call attention to Private Bills for divorce in Ireland; and to move that a Return be made to this House of all Private Bills presented during the last five years for effecting divorces, showing whether the petition was presented by husband or wife, what was the matrimonial offence alleged, the Parliamentary history of the Bill, and the total cost to the parties.

The noble Earl said: My Lords, in 1857, when the present Matrimonial Causes Act became law, I think I am correct in stating that a promise or an intimation was made by the Government of the day that in the following year they would propose a measure to extend that law to Ireland. Precisely half a century has elapsed, and not only has the law not been extended to Ireland, but I am not sure that an attempt has been made to do so, and it is still necessary for persons who live in Ireland and who desire divorce——

LORD **ASHBOURNE**: Who made the promise?

EARL **RUSSELL**: I regret to say I have not refreshed my memory by looking up the debates, but I think I am correct in saying that a promise was made.

LORD **ASHBOURNE**: I do not think so.

EARL **RUSSELL**: I will look it up, and communicate with the noble and learned Lord privately. But, whether there was a promise or not, it has not been done, and it is still necessary for persons who live in Ireland and who desire to obtain a divorce to proceed by the cumbrous process of an Act of Parliament. I do not desire that this Return should contain the names of the parties. It would be quite sufficient to indicate them, but I do think it would be useful for the purpose of comment to have some such Return, and it could be prepared at small cost. My object is that when this Return is presented attention may be called, if it should seem desirable, to the very large expense which has to be incurred, and to the fact that, in consequence, divorce in Ireland is entirely the privilege of the wealthy.

Moved, "That there be laid before the House a Return of all private Bills presented during the last five years for effecting divorces, showing whether the petition was presented by husband or wife, what was the matrimonial offence alleged, the Parliamentary history of the Bill, and the total cost to the parties."—(*Earl Russell.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN): My Lords, I see no objection to the granting of the Return for which the noble Earl has moved, but I certainly dissociate myself from his object. I am quite certain that he is doing wrong in attempting to impose any law upon Ireland, if the people of that country do not wish it. The expression "the Parliamentary history of the Bill" is rather vague. I suppose the noble Earl means what the House did with it, and whether the Bill became law.

EARL RUSSELL: Yes, that is exactly what I mean.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I see no objection to the granting of that and the other information asked for. We could not, of course, give the amount of the solicitors' bills and the total costs of the parties; but the Parliamentary costs we certainly could give, and if the noble Earl will amend the Motion accordingly I will accept it.

EARL RUSSELL withdrew the Motion before the House, in order to submit it in an amended form.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Earl Russell.

Moved, "That there be laid before the House a Return (omitting names) of all Private Bills presented during the last five years for effecting divorces, showing whether the petition was presented by husband or wife, what was the matrimonial offence alleged, the result, and the Parliamentary cost to the parties."—(*Earl Russell.*)

*LORD ASHBOURNE: My Lords, I am not in the least surprised at, but am gratified for, the cautious and careful way in which my noble and learned friend has spoken of this matter. I heard with surprise the statement of the noble Earl opposite that in the year 1887 a promise——

EARL RUSSELL: I said in 1857.

*LORD ASHBOURNE: I am not a young man, but that goes beyond my Parliamentary experience. I was, however, surprised to hear his statement. I have been a good many years in public life, having sat in the House of Commons before I had the honour of a seat in your Lordships' House, where I have sat now for over twenty years, but I have never heard it suggested by any section of opinion in Ireland that the extension of the divorce law to that country was desired. The bulk of the population are Roman Catholic, and naturally the idea would be repugnant to them; and I may add that I have never heard any section of Protestant opinion in Ireland express a desire in this direction. If any grievance were felt in Ireland on this matter I think that steps would have been taken in the direction of a change in the law, but I do not believe that any change is desired by any substantial section of opinion. I do not think, however, that there would be any objection to giving the Return apart from the names.

There are very few cases in Ireland in which anyone, rich or poor, appeals to the law in reference to this disagreeable subject. Before a Bill is submitted to your Lordships there must be a suit for damages and also a decision of our Court in Matrimonial Causes giving a separation *a mensa et thora.* Then a Bill has to be introduced into your Lordships' House, and on the Second Reading sufficient evidence has to be given to justify your Lordships in passing it. It then goes down to the other House and is treated as an Act of Parliament. Of course, the proceedings are cumbrous and expensive, but where you find a nation submissive without repining for a vast number of years that may be taken as some proof that the nation is not very anxious for a change to be made. There have been two or three Bills of this nature this year, and I think that would probably more than represent the average of previous years.

I drew attention on one of these occasions to what I think might be a beneficial change, and the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack concurred. It has been the habit under a Standing Order about a century old to introduce in these Bills a provision forbidding the parties who are incriminated to marry. That is a rather cruel provision, and invariably it has been struck out before the Bill left your Lordships' House. According to practice the Bill is introduced in that form, and also by practice the provision is struck out on Third Reading; and I ventured to suggest, earlier in the session when one of these Bills came up, that it was desirable that the form should be modified and the Bills introduced without that clause. My noble and learned friend on the Woolsack did not indicate the slightest disinclination to adopt that view, but I think he felt that owing to the antiquity of this practice it was desirable to make some inquiry.

* **EARL RUSSELL**: My Lords, I think it would be convenient that I should at once remove some misapprehension which has arisen in the minds of the noble and learned Lords who have spoken. I may say at once that I am not proposing now or at any time myself to introduce legislation for Ireland in regard to this subject. But there is one aspect of the matter in regard to which I think the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack will to some extent give me his sympathy. It may be that in an overwhelmingly Catholic country where the majority of the population do not approve of divorce, there is no desire for an enactment of that kind; but on the ground of religious equality and religious freedom it does appear to me to be a hardship that because a person is one of a small minority in an overwhelmingly Catholic country he should be deprived of a remedy which would be open to him elsewhere. This is essentially one of those privileges which it is not a democratic thing to maintain. There is nothing democratic about it. The noble and learned Lord opposite has stated the enormous number of formalities that attend this matter, and it is not altogether fair, and does not make for equality between rich and poor, that one person should be able to obtain a remedy which is denied to another. I thought I detected in the speech of Lord Ashbourne an attachment to these practices on account of their hoary antiquity; but, speaking for myself, I must say I prefer to see them preserved in museums and in books and not applied to unfortunate living people who have to suffer from their existence.

On Question, Motion agreed to.

THE TERRITORIAL ARMY.

LORD MONTAGU OF BEAULIEU: My Lords, I rise to ask the Lord Chancellor in connection with the proposed new arrangements under the Territorial Forces Bill, Section 28 (3)—(1.) Does property, of whatever kind, now held by a commanding officer, as such, pass as a matter of course to the County Association at the date mentioned in a scheme for the establishment of the Association for that county, or what other date, *e.g.*, suppose a commanding officer is accumulating, either by saving or from private sources, a fund for the better financing of his corps, is he in whole or part to lose the control of and the benefit from that fund; (2.) Will all subscriptions or presents given to a corps after it belongs to the Territorial Army be pooled for the benefit of the County Association, or will it be appropriated to the use of the particular corps in question; (3.) Are trustees or other persons interested in any trust debarred from the ordinary legal means of defending their property, and is their resort to the Courts, for the purpose of adjudicating on their trusts, extinguished under the latter part of Section 28 (3) (*c*); and (4.) In cases where an agreement or lease affecting real or personal property has been entered into benefiting a corps so long as it is a volunteer corps, does this agreement or lease lapse when the corps joins the Territorial Army, and becomes a unit under it.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: The Answers to the Questions arising out of Section 28 (3) (c) of the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill are as follows: (1.) The property now held by the commanding officer will pass to the Association if the Order in Council so provides. The date at which the transfer will take effect will be fixed by the Order in Council. In the example cited the commanding officer will lose control of the fund, but after transfer the fund will still be held for the benefit of the corps for which it was accumulated. (2.) Subscriptions and presents given after the corps has become part of the Territorial Force will be devoted to the purposes for which they are given. (3.) Until the transfer the rights of the trustees will remain unaffected; after the transfer the Association will become trustee. The powers of the Secretary of State to determine the trusts only arise after the transfer to the Association, when the former trustees will have ceased to be trustees; the powers conferred on the Secretary of State were conferred in deference to the wishes of Sir Howard Vincent, by whom the present form of paragraph (e) was proposed on behalf of the Volunteers. (4.) This is a question of the construction of the instrument under which the trust in favour of the corps was created. A corps would not be less a Volunteer corps because it became part of the Territorial Force unless the instrument expressly referred to a Volunteer corps under the existing Volunteer Acts.

LORD MONTAGU OF BEAULIEU: Would the Answer to Question (1.) apply to the case where there was a mixed trust—a trust of commanding officers and trustees?

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: Speaking off-hand, I feel pretty sure it would apply. The essence of the thing is that the trust is transferred, but the purposes remain.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, I do not pretend to be familiar with the feelings of Volunteer officers in respect of these affairs, but I cannot help thinking that in some cases a certain amount of heart-burning may be created by the diversion contrary to the wishes, perhaps, of the donor, who may still be alive, of gifts which have very recently been made to Volunteer battalions. Of course that is a matter on which I am not able to pronounce an opinion, but if there are cases in which there is such reluctance or opposition, would it not be possible for the Government to consider the insertion of words in their Bill which would safeguard them? I have in past times been familiar with this sort of question in respect of charitable trusts. Charitable endowments recently granted are saved in most Acts of Parliament from any possibility of diversion from the intention of the donor, and that certainly was the case when the Government, to which I think the noble and learned Lord belonged, proposed to disestablish and disendow the Welsh Church. In that case it was felt that any such diversion would not only be a hardship but a very grave and serious grievance. I cannot say that that would be the case in regard, for instance, to a Volunteer drill hall, but still difficulty might arise and certain objection be felt, and I think it would be well if the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack would consider whether protection could not be given in those cases.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I think the custom in the Irish Church Act and other Acts of that kind has been that beyond a certain period of time the Statute does not interfere at all, or does not interfere with quite recent gifts. I am not quite sure that that is quite the same case as this. It is a matter of justice, of course, of equity and fair play, but it is also a matter of policy, and I think the best thing would be to communicate with my right hon. friend, Mr. Haldane. I will convey to him what the noble Marquess has said, and, if my right hon. friend thinks my advice worth having, I will confer with him.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I am sure he will.

CROWN ESTATES AND SMALL HOLDINGS.

VISCOUNT HILL moved for a Return of the farms belonging to the Crown

Estates which have been or are being converted into small holdings, showing in each case—(1) The acreage of the converted farm, the name of the tenant, and the number of labourers employed upon it; (2) The number of holdings into which the farm is now divided or being divided, with names of occupants, distinguishing between agricultural labourers previously employed upon the farm, agricultural labourers previously employed in the neighbourhood, and tradesmen or artisans.

The noble Viscount said: My Lords, I very much doubt whether His Majesty's Government, or even the noble Earl himself, are fully acquainted with the grave anxiety that exists in the minds of farm labourers at the present moment in regard to this matter. Ever since the introduction of the Small Holdings Bill into Parliament, I have been at pains to discuss with these farm labourers what their future position will be under the Act, and the result of these discussions demonstrates only too plainly that the future prospects of these labourers are most unfavourable. Notwithstanding all this great uncertainty, the majority of farm labourers do not oppose the principle of the Bill. What they cannot understand is why they should be turned out of their present occupation to make room for the small holders, and forced to seek employment elsewhere.

My recent investigations into the working of small holdings, extended over some fifty years on one estate, have convinced me that a comparatively small number of the present farm labourers will be in a position to become the owners of small holdings, for it must be frankly admitted that the small holder of to-day is in a far less prosperous condition than he was fifty or sixty years ago. I would like to refer for a moment to a statement made by a relative of mine in connection with the small holdings on a late estate of my own. He cited some holdings as being in a prosperous condition. That statement by itself is most misleading, for he was not in a position to know how the small holders arrived at that prosperity. Those holdings have been in existence for generations. and the men on them have derived their prosperity, not from what they have made out of the holdings, but from constant employment on the neighbouring large farms and other resources, such as contracting, road-making, and general work on the estate.

I maintain that the more land that is converted into small holdings the less will be the demand for farm labourers in the present condition of agriculture. By breaking up large farms into small holdings it stands to reason that one-third of the labourers on the original farm will have to seek employment elsewhere; one-third may remain upon the farm, and the remaining third become owners of the small holdings. I could give the noble Earl many instances to illustrate this, but at this late hour I will not detain the House. I understand that the noble Earl is willing to give a concise statement in reply to my Motion. If that is the case allow me to assure him that it will materially assist the passage of the Small Holdings Bill through Parliament, and I hope it will also remove to a considerable extent the grave anxiety which at present exists among farm labourers. Before sitting down I would like to ask the noble Earl whether he will also state how much rent the farm was let for to the original tenant and how much rent is obtained in respect of it now as small holdings, and what are the expenses of the full equipment of a small holding.

Moved, "That there be laid before the House a Return of the farms belonging to the Crown Estates which have been or are being converted into small holdings, showing in each case—(1) The acreage of the converted farm, the name of the tenant, and the number of labourers employed upon it; (2) The number of holdings into which the farm is now divided or being divided, with names of occupants, distinguishing between agricultural labourers previously employed upon the farm, agricultural labourers previously employed in the neighbourhood, and tradesmen or artisans."—(*Viscount Hill.*)

LORD HENEAGE: My Lords, I desire to intervene in support of the Motion of the noble Viscount, and to say a few words as to the procedure which is now being pursued in creating what I may call an artificial demand for small holdings in the various counties in which the Crown lands exist. I agree with my noble friend Viscount Hill that there is great anxiety among farm labourers with regard to the possible effect of the Small Holdings Bill. I am myself in favour of small holdings so that labourers may rise from the bottom to the top, and should support any properly and well considered Bill. But I strongly disapprove of the spirit in which the inquiries have been carried out by the Crown Commissioners in regard to the Crown lands. The last thing I should wish to do would be to make a personal attack on my noble friend. It is the procedure that I complain of. I think the noble Earl's zeal has rather overrun his discretion, and I am not sure that the noble Earl has always taken good advisers into council. The case to which I wish to refer is not only an object lesson with regard to Crown lands, but one for your Lordships to consider when the Small Holdings Bill comes before you.

The case I wish to bring before you is that of the Crown farm in the parish of Croft. Croft is an urban village in Lincolnshire, and the sole Crown tenant is Mr. John Searby, whose family have occupied the farm since 1817. It is a farm of 211 acres of mixed land. The parish consists of nearly 5,000 acres, including some 200 acres of foreshore, and there are about 630 inhabitants, of whom 100 occupy holdings of various sizes either as freeholders or tenants. Sixty-five of these holdings are under twenty acres, nineteen are over twenty and under fifty, and there are only nine, including Mr. Searby's own, over 100 acres; so that this is a typical small holdings parish. Allowing the usual estimate of five persons to a family, including the wife and children, and for a certain number of single men and women and farm hands, you find that nearly every person who owns a house in that parish is really an occupier of land. Yet this is a parish in which it is thought necessary to hold an inquiry as to whether anybody wants small holdings.

On April 30th last, a letter, signed F. Hellard, was sent by my noble friend, as a Commissioner of Crown Lands, to the chairman of the parish council of Croft, and in consequence of that letter a parish meeting was held on May 24th to inquire whether there were any applications for small holdings. A number were put in. I think the original applications were for 400 acres, but I understand that they have dwindled down on reconsideration to 230 acres. Although the chairman of the parish council was invited to find out who would like to peg out some of Mr. Searby's land, Mr. Searby himself received no intimation in the matter, and had no knowledge whatever of this Star Chamber inquest. Neither had Messrs. Carter, Jones and Sons, who have been appointed agents to the Crown lands by my noble friend, and on being written to by Mr. Searby they replied that this was the first they had heard of the matter and that they sympathised with Mr. Searby's position. I do not think there can be a clearer case of stimulating an artificial demand for land amongst tradesmen and others, who may probably like to have a little accommodation land, but who can well afford to get it and pay for it.

Lord Heneage.

We understood that the great cry at the last election against landlords was that they would not let labourers have land. But this is not a question of labourers at all. Not more than one or two were genuine cases of labourers applying, and there was only one application for land under ten acres. The greater portion of the applications were for ten acres of arable and ten acres of grass land combined, and by men who already have land. I think this is such a strong object lesson that I would like to give a description of the class of men who applied on this occasion. The first is a man who had sold his own holding of eleven acres and had gone to live some four or five miles off on a farm of forty acres. The next is a man who occupies twenty acres adjoining the Crown land. Another one has a small farm in the next parish, and the next applicant has thirty-six acres of land. And so on the whole way through. They are from start to finish not agricultural labourers, but tradesmen and well-to-do men who have themselves already got two occupations. I do not grudge them their occupations or their land, but I do say that these are not the men who have any right to come forward and claim the advantages of getting land under the Crown when they have sufficient land of their own, and when it is to be done at the expense of other people. I think your Lordships will agree with me that this is a case of robbing agricultural Peter for the trading Paul's selfish benefit.

In the case of Croft not one single agricultural labourer would be brought back to the land, but there would be a farmer less and his labourers. Therefore I do not think this can be put forward as a case of bringing men back to the land or of enabling agriculturists to hold the land. I should like to ask my noble friend two or three questions. My first question is, "Why was there any inquiry at all in this case?" There was no application from anybody, and, as has been proved, there is not a single labourer who wants land. Secondly, by what authority did my noble friend, acting as a Crown Commissioner, call upon the chairman of the parish council to conduct this inquiry for the purpose of pegging out the land of a farmer who had not himself been given notice to quit and had no knowledge of the proceedings? Thirdly, I should like to ask my noble friend whether this is the spirit in which it is proposed that the Commissioners of Crown Lands and their agents and touts are to act under the proposed powers of Part I of the Small Holdings Bill? Again, in what manner will these "agitations" bring back labourers or benefit the present labourers?

I have had considerable experience, extending over forty years, in dealing with small holdings and every kind of holding, for I have never had an agent on my estate. I assert that the best way to advance labourers' interests is by small holdings of from five to fifteen acres, where there is at the same time regular employment for those occupying the holdings. Labourers do not require twenty or thirty acres in addition to regular wage-earning employment, and they cannot live upon such holdings without. When a man has done sufficiently well on his small holding and in wage-earning, and has put by some £300, he can take a small farm of from forty to fifty acres, and he is then absolutely free and independent of all labour, and can get his living on that land with the assistance of his own family. During the forty years that I have managed my own property I have seen one-fourth of the present tenants rise from labourers to farmers, having not only forty or fifty, but in two cases 250 acres of land each; and therefore I think your Lordships will not complain that I have ventured to intrude in calling attention to this question, which I regard as a most serious one in the interests of the labourers themselves. No one would do more than I would to assist my noble friend if I thought it would bring back labourers to the land, and if there was work. The question is a serious one for labourers, and I trust it will be carefully considered in their interests.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (Earl CARRINGTON): My Lords, I hope the noble Viscount will not think me discourteous if I confine myself this afternoon to the Question he has placed on the Paper. I fully recognise the great interest that is being taken by the agricultural labourers in this question, and I believe it is the fact that in every village the question of small holdings is being very earnestly discussed. As far as the Government are concerned, perhaps I might be permitted to say that we are gravely considering whether in the new Bill the interests of the labourers are sufficiently protected, and we are most anxious that no injustice of any description should be done.

The noble Viscount has asked for a good deal of detailed information, and I must ask for the indulgence of the House if I do not answer the questions to everyone's satisfaction, because I have only been entrusted with the responsibility of a Crown Commissioner for six months, and I have had in that time to make a change in the management of the Crown Estates. Consequently, we are only just feeling our feet, and I have not the whole subject yet fully in hand. The total acreage is 62,000 acres, divided into ninety-one farms of from 250 to 1,000 acres, over forty-five farms of from fifty to 250 acres, forty-three small holdings and 283 acres of allotments. The largest areas are in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire. In Lincolnshire, in 13,240 acres, there are only five small holdings, and eighty-nine acres of allotments. In 7,000 acres in Yorkshire there are twelve small holdings and no allotments at all; and in Cheshire, where the Crown has 2,630 acres, there are three small holdings and no allotments. Since we have made a change in the management of the Crown Estates five Crown farms have been dealt with.

When I took the matter over, I found 3,494 acres of land in hand, rather a large proportion, and included in that land was a farm at Burwell in Cambridgeshire. That farm comprised 917 acres. In answer to the noble Viscount, I may say that the name of the late tenant was Stevenson. He is the chairman of the Cambridgeshire County Council, and a very fine farmer, I believe. The old rent of these 917 acres was £814, and the present rent is £700. That farm was in hand for two years, and no one could be got to take it. A farm in hand is not a lucrative concern, and the Crown lost practically £350 a year; it got no rent, but the fees had still to be paid for superintending the farm. Now we get £700 a year for the farm, which is let on a twenty-one years' lease to my hon. friend Mr. Charles Rose, the Member for the Newmarket Division of Cambridge. The result has been a clear gain of £1,000 a year to the revenues of the Crown.

On that farm there had been employed thirty-nine labourers, and they, of course, received notice to quit when the farm was let to my hon. friend to be cut up for small holdings. Eight of them had served on the farm for twenty years, two from fifteen to twenty years, four from ten to fifteen years, and five from five to ten years, and thirteen under five years. But when the last tenant—Mr. Stevenson—left the farm two years ago, there was, so far as I know, no question of compensation to be paid to those labourers, though eight of them had worked on the farm for over twenty years. It may, however, be said that these men would have been taken on by an incoming tenant. I am not at all sure that this would be the case, because with a new tenant the amount of the labour bill is of great importance. The tenant would probably have calculated that he would want twenty-six labourers to work that farm. He would bring his own cowman, shepherd, and carter with him, and that would mean the dismissal of fifteen or sixteen labourers on that farm, and they would have gone elsewhere.

I accept as a compliment to the small holdings policy of His Majesty's Government the great interest which has been shown in this particular question, because if this farm had been let to one man I do not think there would have been very much public anxiety to know what had happened to these men or whether the tenant was a farmer or a retired tradesman, so long as he was a solvent farmer and a man who could be properly accepted by the Crown Commissioners. Indeed, a good deal of nonsense has been written to the papers about this Burwell Farm by a gentleman named Ryley. Mr. Ryley is the Unionist or Conservative agent for the Stowmarket Division, and he was in days gone by, I believe, political agent to Mr. Chaplin in the Sleaford Division of Lincolnshire.

I daresay some noble Lords read the bogus manifesto which was published in *The Times* and in various other papers purporting to be written by these poor, dispossessed labourers. I will not weary your Lordships by referring further to that manifesto, but I should like to be allowed to call the attention of the House to a resolution which was passed at a public meeting held in Burwell some little time ago. The Rev. Mr. Upton, Chairman of the Parish Council, was in the chair, and a resolution was proposed and unanimously passed declaring that—

> "This crowded meeting of inhabitants of Burwell, having considered the manifesto of agricultural labourers which was published in *The Times* and other newspapers, and knowing all the circumstances of the case, expresses its indignation that such a number of falsehoods and misstatements should have been made public, and strongly condemns the action of Party agents in drawing up the manifesto and securing to it signatures of labourers, many of whom have confessed that they were ignorant of its contents and purpose. This meeting denies that any labourers have been thrown out of employment by the conversion of Crown lands into small holdings, the demand for labour having greatly increased."

They assure Mr. Rose that his treatment of the labourers who did not wish to take up holdings, in giving them £389 by way of compensation, has been most considerate and most generous.

On this I may say that when my hon. friend thought of taking this farm he came and said that no hardship must be done to the labourers, and he made it a point that the Crown Commissioners should settle the amount of compensation. He gave them to understand that if that was not done he would throw up the whole thing and have nothing to do with it. They gave way, and the matter was settled by the Commissioners, a sum of £389 being paid in compensation to the thirty-nine labourers who had received notice. All of them had land offered to them, but I am informed that they were persuaded from taking it. I sent down an inspector recently and the report I received is very satisfactory. The land has been let to seventy-five tenants, and has been laid out to great advantage; the amount of stock on the farm is good, and the farm is well managed and properly cultivated. I have a description of the tenants of the Crown land at Burwell, their occupations, and where they came from, and I hope the noble Viscount will accept that—it will be published shortly —as part of the information for which he asks in this Return. Before leaving the subject of Burwell, I may say that several suitable applications for small holdings have been received from suitable people in excess of the amount of land available, and to satisfy which I estimate that at least 500 more acres would have been required. I hope to get more land in that neighbourhood, where it is very much wanted, and the first persons who will be accommodated thereon are the Burwell labourers who, acting on the foolish advice of their old manager, would not accept the terms offered to them. This action they now very much regret.

There is a farm of 440 acres in Wiltshire, where the old rent was £131 and the new rent £150. I let that land in ten minutes to the parish council, whose representative came to see me. There is a further application from that neighbourhood for 558 acres. There are sixty applications; fifty-five of these come from applicants in the parish, and all, I am told, are likely to succeed; but I will endeavour to get further information from the parish council. Then there is a farm of 151 acres in Yorkshire. The old rent was £380 and the present rent is £400. That has been let to the Corporation of Scarborough with another farm very close by—a farm of 327 acres, the tenants of which were the Rev. Mr. Marshall and the Rev. Mr. Hawkins. The Scarborough Corporation will get possession of that farm at Michaelmas. They propose to let the two farms to small holders, and as soon as I can get a Return from them I will send it to the noble Viscount. The old rent of this farm was £1,015, and the rent that will be paid by the Scarborough Corporation will be £1,100. I may say, with regard to these two reverend gentlemen, that they were in the habit of sub-letting a portion of their land to farm labourers and others, not entirely at a loss to themselves. That is a proceeding which has been severely knocked on the head, and which I hope will be entirely stamped out from the Crown lands.

The last is a farm in Lincolnshire. It is of 937 acres, and the tenant was an old lady named Mrs. Eastlands. The family have been for a considerable time —sixty or seventy years—on the farm; the old rent was £1,149, and the new rent is £1,349. Five hundred and sixty-nine acres have been let to the South Lincolnshire Syndicate, and 368 acres have been let to Mr. Eastlands, the son of old Mrs. Eastlands, at an increased rent of £115. The increase in the rents of the five farms is £210. Mr. Eastland had before this rushed into print, and there were sensational headlines in a Conservative paper:—"A land grabbing Government. Eviction of a Norfolk farmer. Appeal to the King." Mr Eastland called to see me and I had an interview with him, taking the precaution of having a shorthand writer sitting behind me so as to have a record of what took place.

Mr. Eastland posed as the evicted tenant; but I had to point out to him that ten years ago Mr. John Clutton, the then agent to the Crown Commissioners, had given his mother notice to quit for farming the land in—well, not a satisfactory condition. These good people received notice to quit and out they went. Then it was discovered that this poor old lady belonged to a family who had been there for sixty or seventy years, and she was then made a yearly tenant. She continued as a yearly tenant, the son being merely in the position of a lodger, and in course of time she went to heaven and the farm became vacant. Mr. Eastland gave himself the airs of the tenant, and I had to point out to him very plainly that the only claim he had on the farm was that he was the son of his mother. I told him that it was the great desire of the Crown to do what all good landlords desire to do, viz., to try and retain families on the farm. He was not in any way a desirable or a satisfactory tenant, but simply for sentimental reasons he was allowed to take 358 acres, which was as much as he could do with, and he seemed very pleased. There he is now a Crown tenant, and so long as he pays his rent and cultivates his land properly he will not be disturbed.

News has arrived this morning from Lincolnshire that a Mr. Crawley has arranged to give up 700 acres, and the 700 acres were yesterday offered to the parish council. I also hear that the Lincolnshire people will have the advantage of a further 73 acres which have been voluntarily offered for the purpose. I am sorry I cannot give the noble Viscount further information.

Lord Heneage told us a most pitiable tale, and I really had a lump in my throat as I listened to the terrible state of things which had been going on at Croft. He said it was an object lesson, and he took great exception to a circular letter which I had sent round to all the parish councils in England.

LORD HENEAGE: I do not know anything about a letter to all the authorities. I took exception to this particular letter in the case of Croft, because the tenant concerned had not heard anything about it.

EARL CARRINGTON: The inquiry in this case was part of a general one addressed to all the local authorities in districts where the Crown lands exist, and there was no attempt whatever to oust anybody in this particular neighbourhood. As to the other questions put to me by Lord Heneage, no land as far as I know has been pegged out, and no farmer has been given notice to quit. The noble Lord may rest assured that the vested interests of the sitting tenant will receive every consideration. The noble Lord surely cannot object to the responsible Minister sending round to the parish councils a circular letter making inquiries.

I have already received applications for 10,000 acres, or one-sixth of the whole Crown lands, from applicants, a great many of whom are very highly spoken of, and by Michaelmas I hope to have 2,000 acres of Crown lands under small holdings without injustice or injury to any sitting tenants. I think your Lordships will see that Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman was perfectly right when he put this large portion of Crown land under Ministerial control, for any question can be asked as to its administration and nothing can be kept back. I think my noble friend Lord Heneage may give us credit for trying to manage this estate without any harshness. In conclusion, I assure your Lordships that our great object is to deal fairly and honestly with the tenant farmers.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, we have listened to a very interesting statement from the noble Earl, enlivened by touches of that local colour which no one else knows so well how to apply, and characterised by a most intimate knowledge of the affairs of the estates the management of which rests in his hands. I say a very intimate knowledge, because he apparently knows not only what happens to the tenants of those estates during their lifetime but even where they go to when they are no longer amongst us. But, interesting as my noble friend's statement was, I hope he will forgive me for saying that it fell considerably short of being an answer to my noble friend behind me as to the points on which he desired information.

My noble friend asked for a statement as to the number of occupants who, under the new system, will occupy these sub-divided farms, distinguishing between the old agricultural population and the newcomers, some of whom there is reason to believe do not form part of what may be properly described as the agricultural population, but are rather artisans and tradesmen from the towns. The only one of the five farms in regard to which the noble Earl gave us any precise information was the farm at Burwell, which he discussed at considerable length; and if he will forgive me for saying so, I think the greater part of his speech must have been prepared rather by way of rejoinder to certain attacks in the Press, which have been so conspicuous recently, than as a reply to the specific Questions of my noble friend. I do not know why the noble Earl assumed that if the Burwell Farm had been re-let to another tenant a large number of the thirty-nine labourers previously employed on it would have been turned out of their houses. They might have been replaced by other labourers if they were unsuitable, but I take it that in these cases a farm of a certain size generally employs a certain number of men and that the new tenant at Burwell would probably have employed somewhere about that number.

Evidently my noble friend is not able to give us at present the whole of these details, and I therefore merely rise for the purpose of expressing my hope that he will give us at an early date what the noble Viscount behind me has asked for—a Return showing exactly how the matter stands in regard to each of these farms. My noble friend must be aware that the vigour with which he is prosecuting this new policy is creating a good deal of anxiety in the country. The policy itself is a good one. We are all in favour of it. We all desire to do what can be done to prevent the exodus of labourers and to retain them upon the soil under conditions as comfortable and convenient to them as possible. But the danger is that in making this experiment you may inflict an amount of hardship upon those who are now on the soil out of all proportion to the advantage which is occasioned to the new small holders whom you create.

The noble Earl was able to give a satisfactory explanation of the case referred to by my noble friend Lord Heneage—I mean the Croft case. But we cannot be surprised that it should have created some excitement. Here is a parish of some 5,000 acres, of which 200 acres are occupied by the only Crown tenant in the parish, and it is a parish in which there is already an unusually large number of small holders. Naturally, when this unfortunate gentleman became aware that meetings were being held to consider how small holdings were to be carved out of the Crown lands in his parish he knew that he was the only person who could possibly be the victim, and he felt considerable alarm. I think, considering the circumstances, it might perhaps have been wiser if this letter, though it was a circular letter, had been sent only to those local authorities in whose neighbourhood there really was a considerable amount of Crown land available for the purpose of small holdings on the one hand and a known dearth of such holdings on the other. Neither of those conditions was present in the case of Croft, and the noble Earl cannot be surprised that his manifesto should have created a great deal of alarm.

VISCOUNT HILL: I should like to express the hope that the noble Earl will give us the particulars in respect of the whole of the Crown lands, and not forget to add the statement which he has already promised giving the expense of equipping the farms.

LORD RIBBLESDALE: My Lords, the noble Earl told us about a farm at Scarborough which had been in the occupation of two reverend gentlemen, I think at £1,000 a year, and which he has now let to the Scarborough Town Council for £1,015 on the understanding that they are to let it out in small holdings. I should like to know whether the Scarborough Town Council are going to equip the holdings, or whether the individuals who are going to take them will be expected to equip them themselves. If the men are to equip them it really means that it will be artisans and small tradesmen in Scarborough who will take up the small holdings, and not the kind of men on whose behalf this policy—the policy of keeping the old agricultural stock upon the land—is being initiated by His Majesty's Government. I know something of Scarborough, and you may be quite sure that if they gave £15 more than the two reverend gentlemen for this farm and promised the noble Earl that they would let it out in small holdings, they knew very well that the people who would take those holdings would not come upon the Scarborough town rates for the equipment of the buildings and the making of fences.

EARL CARRINGTON: My Lords, I can assure the House that I do not wish to keep anything back, and I will do the best I can to ascertain the information asked for. As regards the Scarborough farm, I am informed that the two reverend gentlemen used to sub-let it at a greatly enhanced rent. The Town Council will be able to let this farm at a considerably lower price than before, which will be a great advantage to the tenant. I regret that I cannot at present give the noble Viscount the information he requires, and for the simple reason that we have only just let off these farms to the local authorities. We have only been running six months, and I have not been able to get the Returns in yet. But when I receive them I shall be only too happy to supply noble Lords with any information they may require. If the noble Viscount will withdraw his Motion I will give him the fullest information at the earliest possible moment.

Motion, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 16th July, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Water Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords]; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed.

Renfrewshire Upper District (Eastwood and Mearns) Water Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Public Accounts Committee.—Second Report brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 252.]

Killery's Divorce Bill [Lords].—Reported from the Select Committee on Divorce Bills, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time.

Killery's Divorce Bill [Lords].—Ordered, That the Minutes of Evidence and Proceedings in the House of Lords on the Second Reading of Killery's Divorce Bill [Lords], together with the Documents deposited in the case, be returned to the House of Lords: And that the Clerk do carry the same.—(*Mr. Attorney-General.*)

Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 280.]

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to: Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill; Bude Gas Bill; King's Norton and Northfield Urban District Council Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to: Wisbech Water Bill [Lords]; United Methodist Church Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill Lords.—Amendments to be considered To-morrow.

PETITIONS.

VIVISECTION (PROHIBITION).

Petition from Manchester and other places, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TREATY SERIES (No. 19, 1907).

Copy presented, of Agreement between the United Kingdom and Norway respecting the Mutual Surrender of Fugitive Criminals. Signed at Christiania, 18th February, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No. 3858 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOILER EXPLOSIONS ACTS, 1882 AND 1890.

Copy presented, of Report to the Secretary of the Board of Trade upon the working of the Boiler Explosions Acts, 1882 and 1890, with Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (EXAMINATIONS FOR THE CIVIL SERVICE).

Copy presented, of Regulations for Admission to the Indian Civil Service; alteration to paragraph 9 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

CROWN LANDS ACT, 1906.

Copy presented, of First Report by the President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, as a Commissioner of Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues, by virtue of the Crown Lands Act, 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POOR LAW RELIEF (IRELAND).

Return ordered, "showing for each Poor Law Union in Ireland—

(1) The number of men, women, and children, respectively (excluding tramp night lodgers), who were in receipt of Poor Law Relief at any time during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1908;

(2) The number of such men, women, and children, respectively, who were: (*a*) persons relieved singly; (*b*) heads of families; (*c*) dependants of paupers;

(3) The number of such men, women, and children, respectively, who received: (*a*) indoor relief only; (*b*) outdoor relief only; (*c*) both indoor and outdoor relief;

(4) The total number of persons included in (1), classified according to the aggregate length of time during which they received relief; and

(5) The number of persons in each of the classes indicated in (4), reclassified according to the number of times on which relief was granted."—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Publication of Report of Inquiry into Bay of Firth (Orkney) Oyster Order.

SIR ARTHUR BIGNOLD (Wick Burghs): To ask the Secretary for Scotland when the Report of the Commissioner who held an inquiry upon the Oyster Order for the Bay of Firth, Orkney, may be expected.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The Report referred to by the hon. Member was prepared by an officer of the Fishery Board solely for their information and guidance. It has not been customary to publish such Reports, and therefore this Report will not be published.

Dock Accommodation for Battleships on the East Coast.

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will state the number of docks on the east coast, north of Dover, capable of accommodating ships of the "Dreadnought," "Lord Nelson," and the "Inflexible" classes; and whether the approaches to these docks are in each case such as to allow of the passage of ships of the classes named at all states of the tide without involving more than the ordinary risks.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The only dock on the east coast capable of taking the "Dreadnought," "Lord Nelson," and "Invincible" class is Stephenson's, on the Tyne, which will accommodate these vessels under favourable conditions, and at moderately light draught. No. 9 dock at Chatham will take the "Invincible" and "Lord Nelson" classes.

Labourers Acts—Application of Michael Delaney.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that an agricultural labourer, named Michael Delaney, sent in a representation under the Labourers Acts to the Mountmellick Rural District Council; that the house in which he at present resides was condemned by the medical officer of health as being unfit for human habitation; and that the rural district council assigned as a reason for rejection that the house in which Delaney lives is a freehold; and will he state whether there is anything in the Labourers Acts barring out from their benefits a man who owns a freehold house which the medical officer condemns as unfit for habitation.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The reason assigned by the rural district council for the rejection of Delaney's application was that he is a freeholder. If the applicant is an agricultural labourer, and does not hold land in addition to the house, he would not be debarred from the benefits of the Labourers Acts. The Local Government Board propose to draw the attention of the rural district council to this question, and to inform them of their views on the matter for future guidance.

Post Office Servants' Committee Report.

MR. WILES (Islington, S.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India, as Chairman of the Select Committee on Postal Servants, whether he is able to state when the Report of that Committee will be presented to the House.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) It is impossible to suggest an exact day for the presentation to the House of this Report, but no time is being lost in its preparation, which is being proceeded with as rapidly as possible.

Payment for use of Bell Rock, Skerryvore, and Dhu Heartach Rock.

MR. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether any sum was paid for or for the use of the Bell Rock, Skerryvore, or the Dhu Heartach Rock, on which lighthouses now stand; and, if so, what in each case was the amount so paid, and when, to whom, and by what lighthouse or other authority was it paid.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I am informed by the Commissioners of Northern Lighthouses that no sum was paid for or for the use of the Bell Rock, Skerryvore, or the Dhu Heartach Rock.

Loans to Irish Local Bodies for Public Work.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury when it is proposed to take into consideration the case made out by public bodies in Ireland for obtaining loans at 3¼ per cent. for objects of public work; and whether any relief of taxation arising from these loans at their present high rates of interest may be expected next year.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) This subject will probably come up for discussion shortly on the Public Works Loans Bill, and I do not think it desirable to make any statement before then.

Kew Gardeners.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he has recently received resolutions from the Kew Employees Union and the Kew Guild, protesting against the gardeners at Kew being called apprentices; and, if so, will he state whether in the form of application for a situation as gardener at Kew, there is any reference whatever to the term apprentice; and, if not, will he see that the men are called gardeners in future by the Department.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The reply to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative, and to the second in the negative. The question of the most appropriate designation of the grade is now under consideration. Perhaps I may take this opportunity of saying that my use of the term "apprentice" has apparently been misunderstood. I used it in no derogatory sense, but merely to convey to the House the idea that the young gardeners in question were afforded opportunities of instruction and self-culture in an advanced school of horticulture.

Sunday Delivery of Letters in the Riverstown Postal District.

MR. A. ROCHE (Cork): To ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to the representations made to the late Postmaster on behalf of the residents of Brookhill, Butlerstown, Coolnacaha, Ballinrising, and Killydonoghue, situate in the Riverstown postal district, to the effect that it was essential and desirable that there should be a Sunday delivery of letters in these places; to the memorial in support of this claim; and to a resolution passed at the Cork Rural District Council in favour of a Sunday delivery in the districts mentioned; and will he state whether it is intended to comply with the wishes of the people in this matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) My attention has been called to the application referred to by the hon. Member. I find that the existing postal service on weekdays to the places mentioned is carried on at a considerable loss; and, in these circumstances, I do not feel justified in incurring additional expenditure for the purpose of establishing a Sunday post.

Messrs. John Brown and Co. and Vickers, Sons, and Maxim and the Fair Wages Resolution.

MR. W. T. WILSON (Lancashire, Westhoughton): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that the firms of John Brown and Company, Limited, and Vickers, Sons, and Maxim, of Sheffield, who contract for work with and supply material to the Admiralty, do not pay the standard rate of wages to the carpenters and joiners in their employ; and whether he will take steps to compel those firms to observe the Fair Wages Clause or otherwise to strike them off the list of Government contractors.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) If the hon. Member will be good enough to furnish me with particulars of Admiralty contracts on which the firms named have not observed the Fair Wages Resolution I will have immediate inquiry made.

Police Note-taker at Meeting at Newtownforbes.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland to state the reason which dictated the sending of a police note-taker to a peaceable and orderly meeting in Newtownforbes on Sunday, 7th July; and whether he was consulted on the adoption of this new departure in the case of Nationalist meetings in Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) A police note-taker was sent to this meeting because there was good reason to apprehend that illegal language would be used at it. This course was taken with my approval.

Sale of the Douglas Estate, Longford.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that there are 1,500 acres of grazing land let to four eleven months tenants on the Douglas estate, in the parish of Clonquish, and near the town of Longford; whether he is aware that 1,200 people were cleared off this property in 1844–9 to make way for a plantation of Scotch graziers; whether he is aware that most of these planters failed, and that this land is still let on the English tenant system by Mr. Douglas, who is at the same time offering for sale to the tenants the uneconomic portions of his property on which a large population live in a state of chronic poverty; and will he direct that the Estates Commissioners will refuse to sanction the purchase of that portion unless the large grazing tract is also sold.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have no information as to the matters of fact alleged in the Question. No proceedings for the sale of the estate appear to be pending before the Commissioners at present, but if such proceedings should be instituted the Commissioners will fully consider the facts of the case.

Relief of Distress in Ireland.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the effect of the present weather upon crops in Ireland; whether he is aware that practically every crop is threatened with destruction owing to long continued wintry weather; and whether, in case of further losses in this direction, the Government will take some special steps to take special powers to relieve distress in the coming winter in Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I refer to the full statement on this subject which I made yesterday in reply to a Question put by the hon. Member for the Connemara Division.†

---

† See page 345.

Return of Irish Departments (Cost, Income, and Expenditure).

Mr. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will grant the Return of Irish Departments (Cost, Income, and Expenditure), of which notice stands on the Order Paper.†

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) It would not be practicable to give a Return in the form in which it is asked for. I am, however, willing to give a Return on the subject, and will, in the course of a few days, communicate to the hon. Member the form of the Return which I am prepared to give, in order that he may move for it if he should be disposed to do so.

Evicted Tenants—Application of A. H. Armstrong.

Mr. PATRICK WHITE (Meath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether A. H. Armstrong, now residing at Knock, Belfast, has applied to the Estates Commissioners to be restored to his late father's holding, situated at Billywood, Feagh Mullah, Kells, county Meath; and whether the Commissioners have approached the tenant at present in occupation of the farm with a view of purchasing his interest, and with what result.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have received Mr. Armstrong's application, but have not yet taken any action in the case. The application will be considered in due course.

Great Western Railway and Conveyance of Devonshire Volunteer Regiments to Camp.

Mr. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he is aware that the Great Western Railway have refused to carry the Devon Volunteer battalions to camp on 3rd August next, and that, as the Great Western Railway is the only railway running near the camp ground, many of the battalions are at a loss to know how to get to the camp on the day named; whether he has any power to compel the railway company to carry these men; and, if not, is it possible for him to grant the men extra pay if they march into camp from stations farther away on the London and South Western Railway.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) It appears on inquiry that the arrangements made by the Great Western Railway Company for conveyance of passengers during the holiday season at the commencement of August did not admit of their meeting the requirements of the 4th Volunteer Battalion, Devonshire Regiment. I am not aware that any other of the Volunteer battalions are similarly affected. I have no power to compel the company to carry these men at the reduced rates. An allowance will be made to the battalion mentioned for the march from Yeoford to Moreton Hampstead, a distance of twelve miles, where they will camp.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Destroyers.

Sir BERKELEY SHEFFIELD (Lincolnshire, Brigg): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether in Germany the life of a destroyer is officially reckoned at ten years; and whether he can state the number of destroyers laid down in Great Britain and Germany in the last ten years and the number projected for this year.

The CIVIL LORD of the ADMIRALTY (Mr. Lambert, Devonshire, South Molton): I am informed that the official German estimate of the life of a destroyer is twelve years. Taking this period, 115 destroyers were laid down in Great Britain, and sixty-one in Germany. Great Britain has now 142 destroyers and Germany sixty-one.

Mr. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): Were not the bulk of these destroyers laid down during the earliest portion of this twelve years? The hon. Gentleman has not answered the Question on the Paper.

---

† Irish Departments (Cost, Income, and Expenditure). Return showing, for the latest completed financial year, the Cost, Income from all sources, and Expenditure of each of all the Irish State Departments, Boards, and Bodies, and the total Cost, Income, and Expenditure; and the total Payments and Expenditure for and in connection with land by the Congested Districts Board, the Land Commission, and the Estates Commissioners, respectively, with monetary return or capital value of set-off, if any.

MR. LAMBERT: I have answered the Question in the light in which it appears on the Paper.

British and German Fleets.

SIR BERKELEY SHEFFIELD: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what is the composition of the German High Sea Fleet and the British Channel Fleet in battleships, armoured cruisers, unarmoured cruisers, and destroyers, respectively.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.) asked whether such Questions were not objectionable, and might not possible harm be done by making these comparisons between our own naval strength and that of a friendly nation? Would not a reference to official Returns give the information asked for?

MR. BELLAIRS asked if the Civil Lord of the Admiralty was aware that such official comparisons were made every year and laid before the German Parliament in a document signed by the German Emperor.

MR. LAMBERT: I think I had better confine myself to answering the Question of which notice has been given. The present composition of the Fleets referred to is:—Channel Fleet: 14 Battleships, 4 Armoured Cruisers, 3 Unarmoured Cruisers, 1 Repair Ship, 1 Despatch vessel. German High Sea Fleet: 16 Battleships, 3 Armoured Cruisers, 8 Unarmoured Cruisers. As to destroyers, none are permanently attached to either Fleet.

H.M.S. "Dreadnought."

SIR BERKELEY SHEFFIELD: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the "Dreadnought" has at any time fired a complete broadside with full charges, namely, eight 12-inch guns firing simultaneously with full charges.

MR. LAMBERT: Yes, Sir.

Ships' Armaments.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the twenty-seven 12-pounder guns carried by H.M.S. "Dreadnought," and the sixteen 12-pounder guns carried by ships of the "Minotaur" type, and the fifteen 12-pounder guns carried by ships of the "Lord Nelson" type, are intended for use against torpedo craft; and, if not, for what purpose are 12-pounder guns carried in such numbers.

MR. LAMBERT: Yes, Sir.

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the 12-pounder guns recently removed from twenty-one armoured ships were, previous to their removal, intended for use against torpedo craft or for what other purpose; and why these guns are no longer required on board these twenty-one armoured ships.

MR. LAMBERT: The guns in question were intended for use as boat and field guns. One gun remains in each ship for use as a field gun, but is not shown in the Return of Fleets, as it is not provided with a ship mounting, and cannot therefore be used as a ship gun. Arrangements have been made for substituting 3-pounders, for use as boat guns, and for replacing the second field gun by a more powerful weapon if required.

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the 12-pounder guns on permanent mountings with which the river class of destroyers are now being armed are intended for use against torpedo craft, or for what other purpose.

MR. LAMBERT: As stated in the reply of my right hon. friend the Secretary to the Admiralty to a Question by the hon. Member for King's Lynn on the 18th June, it is not desirable in the public interest that information connected with re-armament should be made public.

Rye Bay Fishing.

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that foreign fishing vessels are in the uninterrupted habit of fishing in Rye Bay; and whether he will take immediate steps to stop illegal fishing by foreign vessels in these waters.

MR. LAMBERT: The reports received from the Coastguard cruiser "Argus," which has recently visited these waters, do not confirm the hon. Member's suggestion; but if he will give a specific case I will have further inquiry made.

Inspection of Contract Work.

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether practical founders are employed as inspectors to examine the foundry work done by contractors for the Navy; whether any representations have been made to the Admiralty on the subject; and whether he will undertake that in future all castings and other foundry work intended for naval purposes shall be inspected by practical founders.

MR. LAMBERT: The inspectors employed by the Admiralty are not practical founders in the sense that they have ever been employed in a foundry; but they are practical officers with a great experience in examining foundry work. Representations on this subject have been made to the Admiralty by the founders working in one of the dockyards, but it is not proposed to make any change in the existing practice, which is that followed in the private trade.

MR. COURTHOPE: How do they discover flaws?

MR. LAMBERT asked for notice.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle) asked if the Admiralty would consider the question of appointing practical men.

MR. LAMBERT: In any new appointments that will be borne in mind.

Sales of Obsolete War Vessels.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if it is the fixed determination of his Department not to sell any obsolete war vessels except with the breaking-up condition attached, even in view of the fact that this country is constantly exporting war vessels of the latest type.

I beg also to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether it is intended to offer at public auction any others of the obsolete war vessels in the Holy Loch or Kyles of Bute; and, if so, will he offer to sell in the first instance at least one of the vessels without the breaking-up condition.

MR. LAMBERT: There is no immediate intention of selling any of the ships in the Kyles of Bute. The Admiralty do not consider it advisable to sell armoured vessels without the breaking up condition.

Rosyth.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can furnish any information as to the progress of the Government harbour work at Rosyth; what number of men are working there; and whether, seeing that there is no Government dockyard on the East Coast of Great Britain capable of accommodating a warship of the "Dreadnought" size at all tides, he will consider the advisability of expediting the work.

MR. LAMBERT: On the subject of Rosyth I have nothing to add to the statements already made.

Army Pensions.

*CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, seeing that many pensioners who are now paid quarterly are at present in workhouses, he can see his way to advising a system of weekly payments through the medium of postal orders post-dated according to the dates required for weekly issue, and so relieve the workhouses from the strain of housing pensioners.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddingtonshire): This question was referred to a Committee under the chairmanship of the Paymaster-General, and the Report of this Committee is now under the consideration of the Army Council.

CAPTAIN FABER: Are we likely to have the Report before the end of the session.

MR. HALDANE: I hope so.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): Has not the right hon. Gentleman had repeated applications from guardians of the poor on this point, to save the men from themselves?

MR. HALDANE: Yes; but the question is one of great difficulty.

Cartridges for Morris Tubes.

*CAPTAIN FABER I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state if cartridges for Morris tubes are available for use at the present time; and, if not, at what date are they likely to be ready.

MR. HALDANE: I understand that the deliveries to which I referred in my Answer to the hon. and gallant Member on the 10th ult., are now being made by the contractors.†

Bonuses for the Special Contingent.

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any, and, if so, what bonus will be given to recruits and men serving in the Volunteers, respectively, as an inducement to join the nucleus third battalions or special contingent.

MR. HALDANE: It is proposed to offer a bonus of £2 to men now serving in the Militia as an inducement to join the special contingent. No bonus will be offered to any other men joining the contingent, but all men serving in it in future will receive an annual bounty.

Indian Rupee Coinage.

MR. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he can state approximately the gain to the Revenue in the last financial year due to the coinage of rupees and other silver pieces as token money.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. MORLEY, Montrose Burghs): The profit on the coinage of rupees is not treated as Revenue: it has hitherto been transferred to the Gold Standard Reserve; and in future one half will continue to be so transferred, the other half being used for capital expenditure on railways. The amount of the profit in 1906-7 was approximately £4,000,000. The profit on other coinage, which is treated as Revenue, amounted in 1906-7 to £254,000.

MR. R. DUNCAN: Are there any signs of an extension of the currency of the rupee beyond their own border?

MR. MORLEY asked for notice of the Question.

The Unrest in India.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India what steps have been taken in the Punjab to allay the unrest by concessions; whether the land tax has been abated in any part of the province; and, if so, by how much; and whether any reduction has been effected in the amount of water rates in the Lyallpur district, where there was lately so much agitation.

MR. MORLEY: To speak of "concessions" in this connection is misleading and inappropriate, because it is the duty of the Government to see that its subjects have no legitimate grievance. So far as I am aware, the land tax was mentioned as a grievance only in the case of the Rawalpindi disturbance. The new assessments have been accepted without complaint by the agricultural population. The Local Government will deal considerately with any genuine instance of over-assessment which may come to light. In the Chenab irrigation colony, where the spring crop has been seriously damaged by rust, it is proposed to remit half the land revenue and half the water rate. In this colony, which forms the Lyallpur district, there has been no enhancement of the water rates, and agitation there did not concern these rates. The Bari-Doab Canal, on which the rates were to have been raised next September, does not enter the Lyallpur district. The levy of the proposed new rates on the Bari-Doab Canal was in April postponed until September, 1908, and pending further inquiry.

SIR H. COTTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the publication in Eastern Bengal of an inflammatory pamphlet, known as the red pamphlet, inciting the Mahomedans to violent measures against the Hindoos; whether one Ebrahim Munshi, the author of this pamphlet, has been prosecuted under Section 108 of the Criminal Procedure Code; whether the proceedings against him have been kept confidential by the magistrate; and whether he can state what the result of these proceedings has been.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxv., 1066-7.

MR. MORLEY: My attention has been drawn to the publication of the pamphlet in question. I am informed that proceedings under the section mentioned were instituted against the author, but that, on his undertaking to publish no more copies, and to withdraw the pamphlet as far as possible from circulation, he was released on his own recognisances. The case was accordingly not brought to trial, and the proceedings, as far as they went, were confidential.

SIR H. COTTON asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he was not aware that the circulation of this pamphlet was one of the principal causes of the unfortunate riots and disturbances which had been so marked a feature of Eastern Bengal.

MR. MORLEY: No, Sir, I am not aware of it, and I greatly doubt it.

*CAPTAIN FABER: Is there any unrest among the Mahomedans?

MR. MORLEY asked for notice of the Question.

SIR H. COTTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to the proceedings of the Deputy Commissioner of Hazavibagh, in Bengal, proposing to give leases to several Europeans to build bungalows on the sacred hill of Parasnath, and to the feeling this proposal has excited among the Jain community in India, by whom the entire hill, which is their principal place of pilgrimage, is regarded as sacred; and whether he will inquire into the case, with a view of allaying disquiet among this influential community and protecting their rights and privileges which have hitherto been always recognised on the Parasnath Hill.

MR. MORLEY: I have no official information on the subject, but from references in the newspapers I gather that, as a result of a conference between the Deputy Commissioner of Hazavibagh and representatives of the Jain community, it was arranged that the latter should submit a statement of their views within two months, for the consideration of the authorities concerned. I am advised that all parts of the hill are not regarded as sacred. A large area was actually occupied as a military sanitorium from 1862–8, and the building then erected is still standing. I see at present no reason why a settlement satisfactory to all parties should not be arrived at.

SIR H. COTTON: Owing to the extreme dissatisfaction caused to an influential and loyal section of the community will the right hon. Gentleman institute further inquiries?

MR. MORLEY said he could not promise to make further inquiries than those he had already made.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the fact that prisoners of State, confined under the Indian Ordinance of 1818, have no means of making any defence, except under the provision of the Ordinance which expressly allows them at all times freely to bring to the notice of the Governor-General in Council any circumstances they may wish in connection with their deportation and confinement, he will take steps to have Lala Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh informed of their rights, and ascertain whether either of them desires to make any defence or complaint in respect of matters alleged against them.

MR. MORLEY: Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh have already been informed of their right to communicate with the Governor-General in Council. The former has done so; the latter has not.

MR. MACKARNESS asked if the defence of Lajpat Rai would be communicated to the House.

MR. MORLEY replied in the negative.

MR. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will place in the Library copies of the *Wafadar* of 28th January, 1906, and of the *Punjabee* of 27th March, 1907, in which newspapers Lajpat Rai is reported to have preached sedition in Lyallpur and Lahore; and whether he will state to the House on what other grounds the law of 1818 was resorted to in the matter of the arrest and deportation of Lajpat Rai.

MR. MORLEY: My reply to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. As for the second part, I can only refer my hon. friend to the Answers which I gave to the hon. Members for East Nottingham and East Clare on the 2nd instant.†

MR. O'GRADY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the latter part of the Question simply asks for the grounds upon which the law was resorted to?

MR. MORLEY: I am afraid I do not understand the Question. The hon. Member asks whether I will state to the House "on what grounds the law of 1818 was resorted to" in the matter of the arrest and deportation. I have already told the House that there were matters connected with this arrest and deportation which I did not think it would be in the public interest that I should state.

MR. O'GRADY asked Mr. Speaker, in view of the unsatisfactory nature of the right hon. Gentleman's reply, whether the Government of India were responsible to the House for its action in the administration of the law; and, if so, whether a Member of the House had not the right to demand that definite information should be supplied to him, publicly or privately, as to the ground for the arrest and deportation of any of His Majesty's subjects.

*MR. SPEAKER: It is open to any hon. Member to put any Question that comes within the rules of order, and it is equally open to the Minister to decline to give a reply.

MR. LYNCH (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon) asked whether the hon. Member was entitled to read a supplementary Question as he had just done. He himself had done so and had been declared out of order.

*MR. SPEAKER: It depends upon the nature of the supplementary Question. There is no rule against reading.

MR. O'GRADY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India why it was that the Government of Eastern Bengal and Assam gave instructions for an appeal to be lodged against the acquittal of one Johar Mandel, charged with the petty crime of a theft of paddy; whether his attention has been called to the fact that the appeal was rejected by the High Court, and to the remark of Mr. Justice Mitter in the case that there is no safety of the subject if the Government appeal in such petty cases; and, in view of the fact that intervention by the Government in such cases amounts to a denial of justice, what steps, if any, he intends taking in the matter.

MR. MORLEY: I have seen a newspaper report of the case referred to, from which it appears that the Government of Eastern Bengal and Assam, being of opinion that there had been a failure of justice, ordered an appeal to be filed. In dismissing the appeal Mr. Justice Mitter is reported to have used the language which the hon. Member quotes. I do not follow his suggestion that the intervention of the Government amounts to a denial of justice, and I have no doubt that the High Court in other cases, as in this, will see that justice is done.

MR. O'GRADY asked if it came within the functions of the High Court to take notice of the petty cases of this character.

MR. MORLEY: It is not for me to say what is the duty of the High Court. It administers justice and is guided therein by statutory authority.

SIR H. COTTON: Have not appeals of this nature become very much more common of late years than previously?

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): And does not the very rejection of this appeal by a Hindoo Judge of the High Court of Bengal conclusively prove that the intervention of the Government in such cases does not mean a denial of justice?

MR. MORLEY: I should have thought so. I will inquire as to the number of appeals. I do not think it bears out the suggestion of the hon. Member for East Nottingham.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxvii., 522-3, 524-5.

Deaths from Plague in India.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India what was the number of deaths from plague during June in the Punjab and in the whole of India; and what is the total for the six months in the Punjab and in India.

MR. MORLEY: The figures for June are: Punjab, 58,821 deaths; Whole of India, 69,064. For six months ending June: Punjab, 632,953; Whole of India, 1,060,067.

Rack Taxing in Rural India.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to an inflammatory pamphlet, known as Rack Taxing in Rural India, in which the acts of the British-Indian administration are so misrepresented as to be calculated to bring that Government into contempt and odium on the part of its subjects and to incite them to violent measures of opposition; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

MR. MORLEY: The pamphlet, I believe, was circulated by a Member of this House for the instruction of other Members of this House. I am content to leave it to their judgment.

Arracan Capitation Tax.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER (Liverpool, Everton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether there is any effective supervision over the capitation tax levied on coolies from Chittagong on entering the province of Arracan; whether he is aware of the extra tax above the 1s. per head demanded from the coolies by the native official; and if steps can be taken to put an end to the system of taxing a man passing from one province to another, which restricts the supply of labour and is injurious to the province.

MR. MORLEY: I have no information on the subject, but will ask the Government of India to give it their consideration and to report the facts.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER: Although the tax is only 1s., at least double that amount is squeezed by the official out of people crossing the border.

MR. MORLEY: I will inquire.

German Steamships to Canada.

*CAPTAIN FABER: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has now any information concerning the proposed new line of steamships between Germany and Canada.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES, (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): No, Sir, I have no information.

Colonial Governorships.

MR. WATT: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies why military men are appointed to governorships of Colonies; what are the duties which they perform in the Colonies which are suitable for that profession; and whether he will in future consider the necessity of appointing commercial or business men to these positions.

MR. CHURCHILL: A considerable proportion of the governorships has been held and I hope always will be filled by civilians; when a military man is appointed to be governor the Secretary of State is satisfied that the particular individual is fully qualified to perform the general duties of government. If the hon. Member will be good enough to look into the subject he will find that in many instances the governor also holds a commission as commander-in-chief and also that in certain instances the governorship is of a distinctly military character, as in the cases of Malta, Gibraltar, and Bermuda, when the nominee is suggested by the Secretary of State for War. For further information I would refer my hon. friend to a detailed reply which I gave to the senior Member for Bath as recently as the 20th June last.†

New Hebrides Convention.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL (Staffordshire, Kingswinford): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any licences have yet been issued under the New Hebrides Convention.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxvi., 590.

Mr. CHURCHILL: No licences can be issued until the Convention has been brought into operation.

Sir GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): Has the attention of the right hon. Gentleman been called to statements from reliable sources that British traders are placed under great disabilities owing to this delay?

Mr. CHURCHILL: I have seen the telegram in *The Times* this morning.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): It is sure to be right, then.

The "Knight Commander."

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether it is the intention of the Government to abandon the claims against the Russian Government for the sinking of the British ship "Knight Commander."

The SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick): The Answer is in the negative.

Mr. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that a year has elapsed since the matter was referred to the Russian Government? Cannot something be done to expedite a settlement?

Sir EDWARD GREY: We have proposed it shall go to arbitration, and I have no doubt that in the long run that course will be adopted.

Mr. Abbott's Ransom.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has as yet received any reply from the Turkish Government with regard to the ransom paid for the release of Mr. Abbott from brigands.

Sir EDWARD GREY: The Answer is in the negative.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY asked whether the Government would not take some steps to urge a settlement of this matter.

Sir EDWARD GREY said that what was in the mind of the hon. and gallant Member had also been in his mind, and he had been looking back to precedents. In the two cases most nearly parallel the time was in one case one and a half year and in the other two and a half years. He intended to prosecute this case with the object of establishing, if possible, a better record; but at present he was well within time.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY asked whether the money received in the past was not derived from the taxpayers of Cyprus.

Sir EDWARD GREY said that in any case it was money which would otherwise have gone to the Porte.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY asked whether he was to understand that the precedent would be followed.

Sir EDWARD GREY: No; because that precedent was established only after discussion had taken place as a last resort. Whether it will be necessary in this case to resort to any measure of that kind I cannot say until proceedings are further advanced.

British Trade Route in Persia.

Mr. LYNCH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can see his way to state, in connection with the pending negotiations with Russia, that it is not proposed to include within the Russian commercial sphere in Persia the old-established British trade route from Baghdad *via* Kermanshah to the interior, and also the British road from the Karun to Isfahan across the Bakhtiari Mountains.

Sir EDWARD GREY: I am unable to make any statement at the present stage of the negotiations.

Egyptian Census.

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the recent Egyptian census has been found to be imperfectly taken; whether, in consequence, it is proposed to take a fresh census; and, if so, when.

Sir EDWARD GREY: I understand that the final figures of the recent census have not yet been issued.

Khedivial School of Law.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that M. Lambert, a Frenchman, resigned the rectorship of the Khedivial School of Law through differences with Mr. Dunlop, the Secretary-General of the Ministry of Public Instruction, Egypt; whether he will explain the reason for the appointment of an Englishman to a Government post invariably held, since the establishment of the School of Law, by subjects of the French Republic, in view of the spirit of Article V. of the Anglo-French Declaration of 1904; and whether Mr. Dunlop will be requested to resign.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I understand that Monsieur Lambert, whose resignation was not desired, resigned his post as Principal of the Khedivial School of Law in consequence of a misunderstanding with the Ministry of Public Instruction on the subject of his leave. In view of the growing demand to enter the English side of the school the Egyptian Government decided to promote one of the existing English Professors to the vacancy thus created; there is no ground for the suggestion that such an appointment is in any way contrary to the spirit of the Anglo-French Agreement of 1904, and no reason whatever for the reflection upon Mr. Dunlop contained in the Question.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON asked if M. Lambert's successor was qualified to give instruction in the French law?

SIR EDWARD GREY: That is a matter for the Egyptian Government, who had before them the requirements for the post and the qualifications of the gentleman appointed.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: Has not the appointment received the assent and approval of the French Consul-General?

SIR EDWARD GREY said he was unable to add anything to the information he had given the House.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the British Adviser to the Egyptian Ministry of Education has refused to accede to the petition of a number of natives holding the secondary education certificates that the evening classes of the Khedivial School of Law should be re-established; and, if so, what is the reason for the refusal?

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Egyptian Ministry of Education has declined to re-establish these classes because the results derived from them previously were very unsatisfactory.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: On what grounds have these evening classes been discontinued?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I believe because from an educational point of view the results were unsatisfactory.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: They were too quick in learning the law.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: In what way were the results unsatisfactory?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I will make inquiry if the hon. Member wishes.

Income Tax.

MR. R. DUNCAN: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can give any approximate estimate of the difference to the Revenue if the exemptions and abatements of Income Tax were based on incomes under one thousand sterling a year, instead of two thousand, in this year's Budget.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fife, E.): There are no official statistics of individual incomes exceeding £700 a year, and all estimates of the numbers, character and amount of such incomes are very largely conjectural. For the purposes of the Budget, I made the best estimates I could with respect to incomes from £700 to £2,000, but no attempt has been made to ascertain the proportion of those which fall between £700 and £1,000; and, in view of the very large number of incomes in the immediate neighbourhood of £1,000, any conjecture based on such data would probably be very wide of the mark.

Income-Tax and Sewers.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Glamorganshire, Rhondda): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if his attention has been called to a decision given by the House of Lords on Wednesday, 26th June, in the case of the Ystradyfodwg and Pontypridd Board and Benstead, to the effect that sewers vested in local authorities and maintained by them pursuant to duties imposed upon them by the Public Health Acts are assessable to the income-tax; if he can give some idea as to the total annual value of all sewers in the United Kingdom and of the burden which will now be placed on all ratepayers in respect of the income-tax assessed upon their public sewers, irrespective of the amount of the incomes of such ratepayers; and whether he will consider the advisability of introducing legislation to relieve the ratepayers of this income-tax burden now placed upon them for the first time since the income-tax has existed in this country.

MR. ASQUITH: It would not be possible to give any estimate of the annual value of all sewers in the United Kingdom. There is, however, no reason to apprehend that the decision referred to will seriously affect the liability of sewers to assessment to income-tax. The sewer in question was not wholly an underground sewer. It was in part carried above ground, or along specially constructed embankments. and it had attached to it certain appurtenances in the shape of an outfall, with sluices and other apparatus. It had been held by a judgment of the Court of Appeal to be assessable to rates, and thereupon the Inland Revenue claimed that it was assessable also to income-tax on the principle that whatever is a proper subject of rates is also a proper subject of taxes. So far as sewers are concerned, the Board of Inland Revenue will be satisfied to treat the judgment of the House of Lords as no more than an affirmation of that principle, and will not regard it as requiring them to depart from existing practice under which sewage works, pumping stations, and so on are assessed both to rates and to income-tax, but purely underground sewers to neither.

Irish Loans.

MR. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can yet state the proposal he will make with regard to the terms for loans in Ireland, as promised by him last year during the discussion on the Labourers Bill.

MR. ASQUITH: The matter is being dealt with in the Public Works Loans Bill, which will shortly be introduced.

Case of Albert Bach.

MR. WATT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the case of Albert Bach, who was sentenced on 9th January, 1904, at Middlesex quarter sessions to seven years penal servitude for receiving stolen goods to the value of 75s.; whether he is aware that this was Bach's first offence, although fifty-six years of age, and that the jury in the first instance recommended him to mercy; whether the ends of justice have been met by four and-a-half years imprisonment; and, if so, will he intervene.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I fear I can only refer my hon. friend to the Answer which I gave to the hon. Member for South West Ham on 5th June, which was to the effect that after repeated and most careful consideration I have not found any sufficient grounds for recommending any interference on the convict's behalf; that articles forming part of the proceeds of three separate cases of house breaking were discovered in his shop, and that a receiver of stolen goods who has a good reputation is for that reason a more dangerous criminal. As my hon. friend is no doubt aware, the prisoner can by good conduct obtain his release on licence when he has served three-quarters of the sentence.

Employment of Young People.

MR. GEORGE ROBERTS (Norwich): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether Order No. 680, making the employment of young persons under the age of sixteen years and children without a certificate of fitness illegal in certain scheduled industries, which came into force on 1st January, 1907, has yet been acted upon; and whether the forms necessary for putting this order into operation have yet been issued from the Home Office; and, if not, when this will be done.

MR. GLADSTONE: The Answer to the hon. Member's Question is in the affirmative. The only form required for the purpose of the Order was a revised form of the workshop edition of the general register; this has been on sale for some time.

Training of Nurses.

MR. HART-DAVIES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will consider the advisability of establishing a Government system of certificates and registration of trained nurses.

MR. GLADSTONE: This matter has been under consideration for some time, but serious objections and difficulties stand in the way of the establishment of any such system as is proposed. I am not prepared to take any action in the matter.

Private Burying Grounds.

MR. H. BEAUMONT (Sussex, Eastbourne): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department on what conditions the right to use private burying grounds is granted to religious institutions; whether any record of such private burying grounds is kept; and, if so, how many have been applied for during the past five years.

MR. GLADSTONE: As I stated in Answer to a very similar Question a year ago, no permission to use such burial grounds as are referred to is required except in the case of a proposed new ground in a place where, in pursuance of the Burial Acts and Orders in Council thereunder for the protection of public health, no new burial ground may be opened without the approval of the Local Government Board. For any further information on the matter I must refer the hon. Member to the President of that Board.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): Is the right to use these grounds granted without any record of the conditions attached?

MR. GLADSTONE: That question should be addressed to the Local Government Board.

Gloucester Port Dues.

MR. HICKS-BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that at the port of Gloucester it is the practice of the local pilotage authority, when collecting pilotage dues payable upon a ship's tonnage, to abstain from adding to the ship's register tonnage the tonnage of the space occupied by deck cargo; and whether he will direct such local pilotage authorities to charge pilotage dues upon the additional tonnage representing deck cargo, in pursuance of Section 85 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, in order that the pilots, on whose behalf such dues are collected, may receive an additional payment in respect of ships with deck cargoes, as directed by the said section.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): I am informed by the Gloucester Pilotage Board that their practice is as described in the first part of the Question. As I explained to my hon. friend the Member for North Somerset on the 11th instant, the Board of Trade have no power to issue directions to a pilotage authority, but I will communicate with the Gloucester Pilotage Board, calling attention to the provisions of Section 85 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, as affecting pilotage rates.

County Court Fees.

MR. FERENS (Hull, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will cause inquiries to be made as to fees at present charged by the county courts for plaints for the hearing of causes for administration matter; whether he is aware that the fees now charged are in many cases beyond the means of the poor for whose benefit county courts were, to a considerable extent, intended; and whether he will appoint a Departmental Committee to consider the matter.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury): As I intimated in my reply to my hon. friend the Member for Merionethshire on the 4th March last, I see no sufficient grounds for considering that county court fees in general are excessive, but if my hon. friend will indicate any particular fee which he regards as exorbitant, I will inquire into it.

Hop Substitutes.

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the recommendations of the 1890 Select Committee on the hop industry as to the compulsory declaration by brewers of all chemical hop substitutes used by them have been put into effect.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The declaration of hop substitutes has not been made compulsory on brewers. But in the Returns collected for inclusion in the "Brewers Licences Return" presented annually to Parliament, brewers are invited to state the quantities of hop substitutes used by them, and these are shown in a separate column in the Parliamentary Return.

MR. COURTHOPE: Will the Government consider the desirability of making the Return compulsory?

MR. RUNCIMAN: The Government do not think it necessary.

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the annual Return of brewing materials includes all hop substitutes used by brewers.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The Return is believed to include all hop substitutes used by brewers. For although the disclosure of the quantities of such substitutes is not compulsory, the Board of Inland Revenue do not find on the part of brewers any reluctance to give the information.

Royal Gardens, Kew.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he is aware that the gardeners employed in the Royal Gardens, Kew, do not at the present time attend lectures of any kind; and whether the Department is now paying the sum of £1 per lecture to certain officials of the Kew staff for lecturing to two men, neither of whom is in any way connected with the gardening section at Kew; and, if so, will he state what action, if any, he proposes to take in the matter.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.): The Answer to my hon. friend's Question is in the affirmative. The lectures in question are provided for the benefit of the young gardeners, who are expected to attend, but who have recently abstained from so doing. The matter is under consideration, but I am unable to make any statement on the subject at present.

The Public Trustee.

MR. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General whether the Lord Chancellor has yet made a rule constituting the office of Public Trustee, as required by Section 14 of the Public Trustee Act; if so, when such rule will be laid upon the Table of this House, in accordance with the provisions of the Act; and whether he can explain how Mr. C. J. Stewart came to be appointed to the office of Public Trustee prior to such rule having been made and laid upon the Table.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir JOHN WALTON, Leeds, S.): No such rule has yet been made. It is expected that the rule will be laid on the Table of the House by the end of the present month. The employment of Mr. Stewart has been provisional. He has not yet been officially appointed Public Trustee, and it is not anticipated that he will receive that appointment until September or October.

MR. BOTTOMLEY: If the rule is not laid on the Table until the end of the present month, how will there be an opportunity for the House to move to annul the rule within thirty days; and how, as the office of Public Trustee has not yet been established, is it that Mr. Stewart has announced his acceptance, and has resigned his connection with the brewery company with which he has been associated?

SIR JOHN WALTON: I anticipate there will be ample time before the House rises to allow discussion of the rule. Mr. Stewart has been provisionally employed to organise the office and the machinery which must be put into operation before the Act comes into use. The appointment has not yet been made, and will not be made until the House has had an opportunity of discussing the rule. It is not expected that it will be necessary to appoint him until the date named.

Mr. BOTTOMLEY: Does the hon. and learned Gentleman agree that at the present moment the office of Public Trustee has not been established and, if so, is there any precedent for appointing a gentleman provisionally to an office which does not exist?

Sir JOHN WALTON: I entirely agree that the office has not been established, and that there is no precedent for appointing a gentleman to an office which does not exist.

Mr. BOTTOMLEY: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General whether he can give the names of the other candidates for the post of Public Trustee which were before the Lord Chancellor when Mr. C. J. Stewart was selected for the office.

Sir JOHN WALTON: Applications for appointment to a public office are usually made in confidence, and I think that confidence ought to be respected. I have not seen a list of the applicants.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Will the Attorney-General tell us in confidence whether the hon. Gentleman is one of the applicants?

Mr. BOTTOMLEY: No, Sir; I am not seeking any Government appointment.

At a later stage,

Mr. BOTTOMLEY asked Mr. Speaker whether it was competent for the hon. Member for South Donegal to impute to him a personal pecuniary motive in any Question he might address to Ministers.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL said that if the hon. Member took exception to his observation he would at once frankly apologise. He interrupted the hon. Member on the spur of the moment, and he thought that no one but the hon. Gentleman himself would have imagined that he imputed any motive to him.

Royal Flag.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether the flag with the device Or, a lion rampant within a double tressure flory counterflory, gules, is the personal flag of the Sovereign in Scotland; and, if not, when it ceased to be so used.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the WAR OFFICE (Mr. Buchanan, Perthshire, E.): The flag as described was the personal flag of the Sovereign in Scotland, and in a sense may be held to be so still, but it has ceased to be so used since the time of the Union.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON: Do I understand that the flag may be used now by anyone without qualification in Scotland?

Mr. BUCHANAN: I do not think the hon. Gentleman had better understand that.

Cost of Police in County Clare.

Mr. HALPIN (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the county council of Clare, having considered the claim of the Royal Irish Constabulary of £39 13s. 2d., costs of extra police in respect of the half-year ended 31st March, 1907, have refused payment of said claim as being an unjust taxation; and whether he will relieve the county from this charge.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.): It is the fact that the Clare County Council have expressed the intention of refusing to pay the charge referred to in the Question. The extra police for which the claim is made consisted of a portion of the Reserve Force chargeable to a specified area, and there is no power to relieve the county of the cost. The necessary statutory certificate is about to be issued in order that the charge may be recovered from the county council.

Goff Estate, Roscommon.

Mr. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have in their possession a farm at Toneroe, county Roscommon, formerly portion of the Goff estate; whether a small portion of this was divided four years ago; whether the remainder is still in the possession of the

Commissioners; and whether steps will be taken immediately to have the rest divided among the small tenants on the estate and in the locality.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that no land at Toneroe appears to be included in any estate purchased by them or in their possession.

Irish Education Grant.

MR. MEAGHER (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland was the sum of £1,000,408 mentioned by him in introducing the Irish Council Bill the sum voted by Parliament for primary education in Ireland for the year ending 31st March, 1907; does the Report of the National Board for the year 1905–6 give the sum voted by Parliament for primary education in Ireland for that year as £1,390,833; was that sum voted by Parliament for primary education in Ireland for that year; and, if so, how has there been a difference of £390,425 between the sums voted by Parliament for the years 1905–6 and 1906–7.

MR. BIRRELL: The sum which I mentioned, or intended to mention, as the amount provided by the Votes for national education in Ireland was £1,408,000, that is to say, the amount in round numbers of the estimate for the current year. It has only recently come to my notice that I am reported to have said £1,000,408, instead of £1,408,000.

Earl of Dunraven's Estate.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, can he say whether the case as between the Earl of Dunraven, of Adare Manor, county Limerick, and his tenant, Mr. George Spearing, of Baybus, Adare, for sale and purchase of Mr. Spearing's farm, has as yet been brought to an issue; and, if not, will the Estates Commissioners use their mediation in arranging the difference as to price consequent on the flooding of a portion of the holding as the result of hatcheries having been put down in the River Maigue flowing by, through the agency of the Earl of Dunraven.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have purchased from Lord Dunraven certain property, including the holding of which Mr. Spearing is tenant. Spearing alleges that his holding has been injured by the diversion of a stream by Lord Dunraven. The Commissioners have fully inquired into the matter, and have come to the conclusion that mediation on their part would not be effective. Spearing urges his claim with the object of reducing, as against the Commissioners, the purchase money paid by them to Lord Dunraven for the holding, whereas his proper remedy is to assert his claim, if any, against Lord Dunraven, by legal proceedings for damages. Spearing has declined to purchase at the price paid by the Commissioners, and he is, therefore, simply a tenant to the Commissioners, who propose to take steps for the recovery of the rent which he is withholding.

Foreign Office Vote.

MR. LYNCH: I beg to ask the Prime Minister, in view of the numerous subjects which there is a desire to discuss on the Foreign Office Estimates including the Sugar Convention, Egypt, the recent Customs Agreement with Turkey, an opportunity for discussing which has been promised, and other subjects, whether he can see his way to devote more than one day to the discussion.

The following Questions were also on the Paper:—

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: To ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the number and importance of the subjects to be discussed on the Foreign Office Vote in Supply, he will extend the time allotted thereto.

MR. REES: To ask the Prime Minister, whether, in view of the wide interests dealt with by the Foreign Office Vote, he can see his way to devote two days to its discussion.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): Perhaps I may answer the Questions of my hon. friends the Members for Tyneside and Montgomery Boroughs at the same time. I am afraid I cannot see my way to affording more than one day to the Foreign Office Vote. With regard to the Sugar Convention, that is a matter of fiscal policy which does not specially concern the Foreign Office Vote.

SIR GILBERT PARKER reminded the Prime Minister that there was a desire to discuss the question of the Congo, and asked him to reconsider his decision.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN could not promise any more than one full day.

Worcester Election Petition.

MR. SNOWDEN (Blackburn): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he is aware that the overseers of the city of Worcester have levied a rate of 3½d. in the pound on the municipal ratepayers to meet the cost of the election petition proceedings, and that women ratepayers are being called upon to pay this rate; and whether he will consider the desirability of introducing early next session legislation which will relieve women from having to pay for the consequences of male political corruption, or a measure by which women may have the rights as well as the duties of citizenship.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am afraid I cannot make any promise on this subject.

Pacific Islanders Act Amendment Bill.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL: I beg to ask the Prime Minister when it is proposed to introduce the Pacific Islanders Act Amendment Bill.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: There are difficult legal questions involved in this matter which are under reference to the Law Officers, and I cannot give any reply to the Question.

Supply.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER: I beg to ask the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to give any extra days for discussion in Supply over and above the three days which still remain, in view of the restricted occasions which the House has enjoyed up to the present time for debate in Supply.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No, Sir, I am afraid this cannot be done. The ordinary opportunities will have been given. I may mention with regard to a somewhat cognate subject, namely the Report of the Public Accounts Committee, that although the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer did not amount to a pledge it involved an acknowledgment of expediency; and an opportunity for the discussion of the Report will be given, but I am afraid it will be in the expiring hours of the session.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) asked what would be the business for Monday, and whether any information could be given as to the business next week.

SIR. H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not think it would be safe to prophesy beyond Friday. On Friday the business will be the Criminal Appeal Bill and other Bills.

HONOURS AND PARTY FUNDS.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) gave notice that at the earliest opportunity he would direct the attention of the House to the brokerage and sale of peerages under the late Administration, and would move a Resolution condemning peerage preference based on gross metallic corruption.

*MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): I desire to make a personal explanation to the House as regards what happened yesterday. An accusation was brought against me of having been guilty of a breach of privilege in publishing a letter in which I stated—first, that honours are bought and sold, and secondly, that out of that war-chest grants are made to candidates who, if elected, are looked upon as secured; and should the Member rebel, he is reproached by the Party whips for not having held to what they looked upon as a bargain. That letter was written because your statement, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister is not responsible to this House for any advice he may give to the Sovereign as to recommendations for honours seemed to preclude any power of calling attention in this House to the subject. If you, Sir, on consideration, adhere to that statement——

*Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member is going to cross-examine me about statements made last week I am afraid I cannot allow him to intervene now. I understood from him that he was going to make some personal statement and apology. I cannot permit him to raise any question of order and cross-examine me on my ruling.

*Mr. LEA: I am endeavouring under great difficulty to make a personal explanation. In view of the fact that I was precluded from attending the debate yesterday, and had to depend for learning what transpired on the reports in the papers this morning, I now desire to say that my explanation was made under a misapprehension. I conceived that the breach of privilege, if any, could not be in the second and minor allegation referred to by the noble Lord the Member for East Marylebone, but in the far more serious allegation that honours are bought and sold. It was to that allegation, therefore, that I addressed the defence I made, without having heard the whole case against me. Upon referring to the reports in the papers, I find that the case made against me, and relied upon, was based on the second, and, as I think, relatively minor allegation I made. I find that upon that allegation alone the debate was conducted, and the House was advised by the Prime Minister not to proceed with the charge, while, with unusual readiness, the Leader of the Opposition was good enough to say that his Party did not intend to proceed against me. With that charge I need no longer concern myself, but the other charge, while kept out of the debate, was not kept out of the division on my conduct. The noble Lord who raised the question took the same view as I took, that the allegation required investigation.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member has misconceived the whole of the effect of the debate which took place yesterday. I think, if he had listened carefully to the speech made by the noble Lord, he would have seen that the only point in the letter which was charged with being a breach of privilege was that which conveyed an imputation upon his colleagues. I am sure that, if the hon. Member has anything to say upon that point, the House will hear him.

*Mr. LEA: I bow to your ruling.

Mr. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): May I also make a personal explanation? In what I said yesterday I did not wish to impute the smallest dishonest motive to the Prime Minister or anyone on the Front Benches. The point I raised was purely a political and Party one, and was not intended to call in question the conduct of any right hon. Gentleman.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir William Brampton Gurdon reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee C (added in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. Hodge and Mr. Gill; and had reinstated on the Committee: Mr. Shackleton and Mr. John Taylor (previously discharged in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill).

Sir William Brampton Gurdon further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C (added in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. Jowett; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. George Roberts.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

NEW BILL.

LARCENY BILL.

"To amend The Larceny Act, 1861," presented by Mr. Courthope; supported by Sir John Dickson-Poynder, Mr. Warner, Mr. James Mason, Mr. Leif Jones, Mr. Hicks Beach, Mr. Lane-Fox, Mr. Everett, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Acland, Mr. Brace, and Mr. Verney; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 279.]

FINANCE BILL.

As amended (in Committee and on re-committal), considered.

Mr. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central) moved a new clause providing that notices of assessment of income-tax shall be issued as nearly as may be in the same terms on or after the first day of December in each year, and the same shall become payable and shall be collected in the same form and at the same time in the United Kingdom, and legal proceedings in the respective countries for recovery of income-tax shall also be taken as nearly as may be at the same time. So far, he said, nothing had been done to remedy the inequality which existed in the matter of the levying of the income-tax in England, Scotland and Ireland. Broadly speaking, the tax should be levied in the three countries in precisely the same way. It was a common and just principle that each country should be treated alike. In recent years there had been a great deal of resentment felt at the way in which the tax had been collected. The notices of assessment differed in the three countries. In Scotland the notice was printed with the words "Notice to pay" in bold type and underlined, whilst in England the demand was simply a polite intimation that the tax was due. In Scotland the notices were issued in September, October and November, while in England they were not issued till the end of November or the beginning of December. He had in his hand a list of notices sent out in the two countries. In Scotland the first was issued on 22nd September and the last on 7th November; of these, thirteen were received. In England, the first was not sent out until 30th November and the last on 24th December, during which time nine were received. He failed to see why there should be this difference in the collection of the tax. It was not due until January, and there was no need at all why the notices in Scotland should be issued as early as September. Of all countries in the world, in Scotland this was the least necessary. Unless this new clause were accepted the Scottish income-tax returns would continue to be received into the Exchequer at an earlier date than was the case with England. Another point he wished to bring out was that of enforcing payment of the tax. A friend of his received a notice that the tax was due within seven days. Unfortunately he was ill in bed at the time and the matter escaped his attention until after the prescribed date. He sent a cheque immediately to the income-tax collector, but it was returned, and he was informed that it could now only be paid to the sheriff's officer. This he did, together with 10 per cent. added for the extra cost of collecting. That was the sort of thing which had been going on in Scotland for many years. Inasmuch as the tax is an Imperial one, he contended there should be no greater pressure in Scotland than in England or Ireland, and he sincerely trusted that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would accept his new clause. On 8th June, 1901, the Secretary to the Treasury stated that Scotland and England should be treated alike and that no pressure should be used in one country which was not also used in another. Since then the question had been brought before Parliament, but no difference whatever had been made in the collection of the tax. The pressure had been going on in Scotland while England had been allowed to lag behind. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated that he was anxious to establish equality between the two countries, and all that this new clause asked was that there should be common justice in the matter. He begged to move.

*MR. J. M. HENDERSON (Aberdeenshire, W.) seconded. He failed to see why there should be any difference between the collection of the tax in Scotland and the collection in England. For 200 years England had been joined to Scotland, and during the whole of that time instead of trying to assimilate the law of the country and its procedure Parliament had been engaged in passing separate laws in the two kingdoms. He saw no reason why the Scottish people should be pressed for their income-tax to a greater extent than the people of England. It seemed to him monstrous that in Scotland notices should be sent out in September reminding a man that he had got to pay a tax in January, whereas in England no such reminder was issued until December. Much of this pressure would seem to arise through the extra vigilance of the Scottish excise officer. The income-tax collectors in Scotland were much more stringent and arbitrary than was the case in England. In the latter country the method of collection was more gentle and reasonable. He urged the Chancellor of the Exchequer to give effect to his hon. friend's new clause so that the process of collection in the two countries might be the same.

New clause—

"Notices of assessment of income-tax shall be issued as nearly as may be in the same terms on or after the first day of December in each year, and the same shall become payable and shall be collected in the same form and at the same time in the United Kingdom, and legal proceedings in the respective countries for recovery of income-tax shall also be taken as nearly as may be at the same time."—(*Mr. C. E. Price.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.) assured his hon. friends that he was entirely in sympathy with them in their desire to remove any disabilities under which Scotland lay in regard to this or any other matter. He hoped, however, that the new clause would not be pressed. In the first place, the hon. Member proposed to prohibit the issue of notices before the first day of December, and he did not think that that was at all a desirable thing. He was aware that the system of collection in England and Scotland was not uniform. He thought the hon. Member would find that upon many estates in Scotland it was the practice to deduct the income-tax from the November rent, and it would be very inconvenient to disturb that arrangement. With regard to the main purpose of the Amendment he entirely agreed with the hon. Member. He did not think the machinery for the collection of the tax should be more stringently enforced in one country than in the other, but what he was anxious to do was to bring England up to the level of Scotland. He had already expressed his opinion on this point, and he trusted that by rigorous and effective administrative action he would be able to get the income-tax in at an earlier date. Scotland had led the way in the matter. He could assure his hon. friend that everything was being done to bring about an assimilation of the dates of collection, and certainly no preference would be shown to the southern side of the border.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) hoped the fact that they had at present a Scottish Chancellor of the Exchequer would somewhat allay the anxiety of hon. Members opposite on this point. He agreed that it was desirable to expedite the collection of the income-tax, although he was inclined to believe that the grievance in Scotland was largely an imaginary one. Whilst he was at the Treasury attention was specially directed to what were called the threatening notices. It was not possible for all those notices to go out on the same day, but the collectors might all begin on the same day to send them out. He thought the pressure should be brought to bear equally in all the three kingdoms, and he wished success to the efforts the Chancellor of the Exchequer was making in that direction. He thought something more might be done to expedite the collection of the income-tax in England, although in his opinion the greivance alleged on behalf of Scotland was very largely exaggerated, and such foundation as existed for it was not a sufficient basis for the superstructure which some hon. Members had tried to place upon it.

*MR. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.) said he could not agree with the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer that this was an imaginary grievance in Scotland. They had had a long fight in regard to it. He raised the same question five years ago, and successive Chancellors of the Exchequer had promised to do their best to bring about an equality. The two predecessors of the right hon. Gentleman had said they could not make the change while the war income-tax stood at 1s. 3d. in the £, but the late Chancellor of the Exchequer set himself to redress the grievance and accelerated the collection in England, with the result that within the financial year he got in an extra £800,000. That was the point he wished to impress upon the House. He had more faith in the regeneration of England than his hon. friend. He thought they ought to direct their attention to bringing up England to the standard of Scotland. Two legitimate grievances had resulted from the present system. One was that the large amount of income-tax outstanding for two months after it was due in England, amounting to £11,500,000, necessitated a great loss to the State in interest. He calculated that in this way there was a loss to the revenue of £30,000 every year. On 18th March they had a very definite pledge from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who said—

> "I think any change ought to be made in the direction of increased stringency in England rather than increased laxity in Scotland."

They ought to accept that as a pledge given by the right hon. Gentleman. The second grievance resulted from the income-tax not being collected within the financial year, which was very detrimental to their financial system. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach put an extra 4d. on the income-tax in one year, and he expected to raise by that another £10,000,000, but owing to the loose system, instead of getting £10,000,000, he could only calculate on getting £8,000,000 within the financial year, and the State had to lose the benefit of the £2,000,000 for that year. Therefore, from the point of view of equality of treatment and making good this loss of interest, he asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer to carry out the pledge he had given. They did not want Scotland dragged down to England's level, but they wanted England brought up to the Scottish standard. If they issued the notices in December the tenant would have to pay his landlord's tax, and at the very latest would have to pay it in the second week in February; consequently he would have to wait for his money for twelve weeks till the Whitsunday term. He thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer might consider whether the tax under Schedule A should not be levied directly upon the landlord. He could point to municipal administration where a system obtained under which the occupier had to pay the landlord's share and deduct it from his rent. That system had now been abolished and the collection had not suffered. He thought it was equitable that the landlord who owed the debt should pay it in the first instance. For these reasons he hoped his hon. friend would withdraw his Amendment, because in its present form it was a step backward. They were now within sight of port after five years fighting, and he hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer's assurance would be accepted.

Mr. WATT (Glasgow, College) hoped his hon. friend would press his Amendment to a division as a protest against the existing inequality. It was all very well for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to tell them that he was trying to bring England up to the Scottish standard. That was exactly what the right hon. Gentleman's predecessors had promised but had always failed to carry out. It was a very difficult task to bring England up to the level of Scotland, and he thought it would be better to drop Scotland down to the level of England. They also had a grievance in the tone of the notices sent out in Scotland, which was arbitrary and almost insolent. In the Scottish form the words were, "To the person on the back hereof. Take notice." He thought that tone indicated that the income-tax collector had the view that Scotland was a nation to be overridden easily. He would vote for the new clause if it was pressed to a division.

*Mr. ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) said he agreed with the Chancellor of the Exchequer in desiring that England should be brought up to the standard of Scotland. The hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow had alluded to the manner and tone of the tax collectors. He himself thought that, at times, there was something left to be desired in that matter. He remembered bringing under the notice of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire, who was then Chancellor of the Exchequer, a grievance of his own. He happened to pay taxes in various parts of the country, and he had always paid his income-tax before the end of January. In the particular year to which he referred he received a somewhat peremptory notice, and when the matter was looked into the right hon. Gentleman found that similar complaints had been received from other Members of the House, who had always paid their income-tax regularly. He hoped that such instructions would be given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to his subordinates of the Inland Revenue as would secure that, in the sending out of the notices, due regard would be had to what was reasonable and proper, so that people might not be harassed and troubled unnecessarily. He was quite willing to increase the stringency of the collection provided this was made uniform and the matter was conducted with reasonable courtesy.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) said that the debate had fully justified the hon. Member for the Central Division of Edinburgh in moving the new clause. This was not an imaginary grievance. Some of his own constituents had been harshly treated in the matter. He received almost every year communications which had convinced him that the taxpayers of Scotland were treated in a different manner from those of England. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had delivered a speech which many hon. Members thought indicated that he had at last made up his mind to deal with the question, and that in the following year there would beno further ground of complaint. The grievances still existed, and his hon. friend's contention that the systems in England and Scotland should be assimilated was fair and reasonable. If that was really the aim of the Chancellor of the Exchequer he would advise his hon. friend to be content with that for this year, in order that the right hon. Gentleman might have an opportunity of seeing what could be done before bringing forward next year's Budget.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs) thought the income-tax payer who was placed at the greatest disadvantage in Scotland was the man in a country district; he got an additional notice-paper when the term came round in November, and he very often paid three months ahead of the corresponding taxpayer in England. So far from wishing that there should be any slackness in the system of collection, he thought the bringing up of the "predominant partner" to the level of Scotland would be the proper solution of the question.

MR. ASQUITH said his hon. friend the Member for the College Division had referred to the tone of the income-tax notices. Manners were a matter of taste and opinion. He had known Ministers accused of "slamming the door." The office of tax-collector was not a very happy one, and he could only say that he would either by example or precept endeavour to infuse a little more amenity into the manners and customs of the tax collectors in Scotland.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said the case to which the right hon. Member for the Rushcliffe Division called his attention was one where through absence from home the right hon. Gentleman had been treated by the tax collector as if he were a person who might decamp and disappear. He thought the difficulty might be met if the Chancellor of the Exchequer would arrange for a little more intercommunication between the collectors. If that could be done a great deal of friction would be saved. He found that wherever he was living for the moment he received a demand to make a return of his income. If he appeared in a district for the first time and had never made a return before, that would be natural, but year after year he was asked to return his income in every place where he might possibly reside. He asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer to consider whether some clearing-house system could be established which would enable the tax collectors to ascertain where a person who had a number of addresses paid the tax.

MR. ASQUITH was understood to say that the suggestion would be considered.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) said he gathered from what had been said that the tax-collectors in Scotland were lacking in the *suaviter in modo* which all desired. As the Scottish taxpayer was particularly sensitive, he would suggest that the Scottish collectors should be removed to England and the English collectors sent to Scotland.

MR. C. E. PRICE said he was glad that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had given an indication that the tax would be collected in the same way in Scotland as in England. On the understanding that the forms for both countries would be printed in precisely the same way and that the collection would be identical, he asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Motion and Clause, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. GRETTON (Rutland) moved a new clause to provide "'that as from the first day of January, nineteen hundred and eight, the duties imposed by Section 2 of the Finance Act, 1901, and by the First Schedule to that Act, shall each be reduced by one-half in respect of British and British Colonial grown sugar." He pointed out that proposals for the total repeal and for the reduction of the tax by one-half had already been considered and rejected, and expressed the hope that the House would favourably consider the proposal he now made. The conditions with respect to the sugar trade had been altered during the last few months by the announcement that the Government would not renew the Brussels Convention in its present form. There was some doubt as to the exact form which the Government action would take. He did not propose on the present occasion to go into all the arguments which could be stated for and against that Convention. The purpose of it, as he understood, was to do away with sugar bounties and cartels, and to equalise the price of sugar in the countries which were parties to the Convention. According to experts, the withdrawal of this country from the Convention would mean the revival of bounties and cartels, and that was not objected to by those persons in this country who had been advocating a change in the Brussels Convention. His proposal had the advantage that it would not increase the cost to the consumer in this country, whether he was a manufacturer or a householder. He admitted that the influence on the price of sugar would be small, but such as it was, it would be to reduce the price to the consumer. There had been a considerable revival in the sugar industry in the West Indies, and it was expected that the industry would be extinguished by the revival of bounties. It was therefore only just and right that they should take some measures by which an important industry in a struggling Colony, and one capable of vast expansion in many other parts of the Empire, should not be stamped out. He admitted that his proposal was, on the face of it, one of Colonial preference. That presented no terrors to him or to a large number of persons in the country. Colonial preference was a policy which had received the support of vast sections of the people and one which many of them desired to see make headway. At any rate, it was a policy worth discussion in that House. They were taunted the previous night by a right hon. Gentleman sitting on the Treasury Bench that they had no concrete proposal to make. That complaint could not be made to-day, because this was a definite and concrete proposal to give Colonial preference in a very important article of consumption in this country. The sugar industry on the Continent of Europe had been developed by a system of giving preference to the home growth. He knew that preference was called protection; but protection might be necessary in cases of this kind. It had certainly been a great drawback to the agricultural and many other industries that no serious effort had been possible hitherto to produce sugar in this country for the home consumer. Under the Brussels Convention, which was now in danger by the announcement of the change of policy of the Government, certain persons, gentlemen of great experience in agriculture, had made experiments in the neighbourhood of Sleaford in Lincolnshire, with a view to starting the cultivation of beet sugar. Experiments made with many different classes of beetroot on different soils, differently treated with manure, showed that beet sugar could be economically grown in this country. The experiments were carefully checked by competent experts, and there was no doubt that an industry of great value to agriculture might be established. The gentlemen who had made the experiments were of all shades of political opinion, many of them being ardent supporters of the present Ministry, so that there was no suspicion that they were made with any Party object. These gentlemen were prepared to establish a factory and to invest a sum of money in the industry, but in the present circumstances they decided on 25th June that the whole experiments must be abandoned and that they could make no further progress unless the Government made some change in their policy. The experiments were made by agricultural associations on subscriptions by their members, and the money for the factory which was to be erected would have been subscribed by tenant farmers and others, not landowners, interested in the cultivation of the land. Contracts had been made to grow beet on 1,500 acres, nearly all of which were small holdings. Not one large landholder had entered into any contract to supply beet. It was a spontaneous movement made by enterprising agriculturists in a large district, and it was free from any speculative character. It was made entirely for the benefit of the land and the cultivation of the soil. The cultivation of beet sugar had enormous advantages. It was very profitable, the least estimated profit being, he believed, £3 per acre; it was a crop which could be advantageously grown continuously without deterioration to the soil; the manurial effect was of great value to the field; and it tended to employ an increased number of people. The House were considering two Bills, one for England and one for Scotland, under which a vast amount of time and a large sum of money were to be spent in the endeavour to keep the agricultural labourer on the soil. Here was an industry by which they could find employment for many on the soil, and prevent land going out of cultivation. It was no use establishing small holdings except on an economical basis, and the cultivation of beet sugar was especially suitable for small holders, who wanted an occupation in which they could profitably employ themselves and be certain of paying their way.

*Mr. SPEAKER said he had listened very carefully to what the hon. Gentleman had said, but he could not connect his remarks with the clause he proposed.

Mr. GRETTON thought he could explain. If the tax was maintained as at present, the home grown sugar industry could not be started.

*Mr. SPEAKER called the attention of the hon. Member to the fact that there were no Customs, and so far as he knew, no Excise duties upon home grown sugar, and therefore he thought his remarks were out of order.

Mr. BONAR LAW (Camberwell, Dulwich) inquired whether it was not admissible for his hon. friend to leave out the words "British and" so that the new clause would be limited to Colonial grown sugar.

Sir F. BANBURY (City of London) also suggested that if his hon. friend left out the words "of British and" his Amendment would be in order.

*Mr. SPEAKER: I did not say that the Amendment was not in order. I said the speech was not in order.

Mr. GRETTON said he was sorry if he had been speaking out of order, but he thought he was urging a view which ought to be put before the House. He would endeavour to confine himself to points which were strictly in order with regard to his proposal to give some discrimination in favour of Colonial production and of home products. On the previous evening the Under-Secretary for the Colonies, when speaking quite guardedly, made a remark which was received with cheers and approbation from the other side of the House. While he declared against discrimination generally he said that discrimination involved a reduction of tariff or a differentiation between the sum which involved a sound and that which involved an unsound operation. That was exactly what he had given his attention to, and his Motion was one to reduce taxation and not to increase the duties on the sugar consumed by any person in this country whether he was a householder or a lodger. He thought he had shown that there were some grounds for encouraging the production of sugar in our Colonies and at home, while the action of the Government would lead to a curtailment of the experiment in regard to the product, which must lead to the ruin of the industry in the Colonies. He begged to move.

*Sir FRANCIS LOWE (Birmingham, Edgbaston) in seconding the new clause, said that the word "preference" seemed to act as a sort of bogey to hon. Gentlemen opposite, and the very mention of it seemed to frighten them out of their lives; but if only they got to closer quarters with it in operation they would get used to the idea and probably they would be willing to extend it to many articles other than that included in the proposed clause. The adoption of this proposal would afford an excellent opportunity of testing this on a small scale, and the experiment could do no possible harm to the people of this country, whilst it might do a great deal of good to some of our Colonies. It would be, for instance, of great advantage to our West Indian possessions, which had suffered so much from the untoward events which had recently taken place in Jamaica. As to home-grown sugar, there were, no doubt, great possibilities open to us in the way of producing beet for sugar in this country, and its production should be encouraged in every possible way. If, as seemed probable, the Government were about to withdraw from the Brussels Convention, it would mean that bounty-fed sugar would once more be allowed to be imported into our markets, and it would then be impossible for sugar to be produced in this country at a profit unless some preference in the way of duties such as that indicated in the new clause were given to the Home producer. At all events the acceptance of this clause would indicate a desire to encourage the people of the United Kingdom to embark upon this new form of industry, which if it were successful would afford employment to large numbers of labourers, especially in connection with small holdings.

New clause—

"As from the first day of January, nineteen hundred and eight, the duties imposed by Section two of the Finance Act, 1901, and by the First Schedule to that Act, shall each be reduced by one-half in respect of British and British Colonial grown sugar."—(*Mr. Gretton.*)

Brought up and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. ASQUITH said it had been pointed out by Mr. Speaker that there were no customs or excise duties on this class of sugar, and therefore the question appeared to be irrelevant altogether, because it was not a subject upon which any discussion could possibly arise. On the other hand, he had no hostility to extending the cultivation of beetroot in this country with a view to the production of sugar. But whatever the merits of the case were we were absolutely bound by the treaties and obligations into which we had entered with other countries of the world. Up to the present moment the Sugar Convention had not been denounced, and it could not come to an end for any purpose till 31st December, 1908. In effect, over nine months must elapse before we could take steps which would involve any violation of our Treaty obligations, and to reduce the tax now would be against our obligations under the present Convention which had to remain in force for five years, and in regard to the termination of which six months notice had to be given. Therefore, until the expiry of the prescribed period he could not assent to the proposal before the House, as it would be a breach of the Convention.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN quite agreed with the effect of the Convention as stated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and doubted whether his hon. friend had the details of it in his memory. He doubted whether he would have made any effort to raise the question except that it was the only way of bringing forward the treatment of Colonial and British-grown sugar. As regarded Colonial sugar they were prevented from giving it preferential treatment as long as the Convention remained in force in its present terms, unless the signatories were prepared to release us. No doubt the matter was one for consideration. His hon. friend recognised that the Government had taken action, but the action was imperfect. What his hon. friend desired was that we should at the earliest possible date set ourselves free from one of the terms of the Convention. We ought to set ourselves free also from the condition that we should not grant a preference to sugar produced by any of our Colonies. He was not concerned now as to whether the Government were inclined to give preferences or not. The present Government would not give a preference if they could. But except for the special reasons given at the time this Convention was signed, we should not admit in any treaty with foreign powers any clause or condition which bound us in regard to our relations with our Colonies. We ought not to bind ourselves to a certain course with our Colonies in any treaty we made with other Powers. When we revised the convention we ought to strike out the part of the protocol which limited our freedom in that respect, even if there was no intention of granting a preference. There was no excise on Colonial sugar, but the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said he would be bound to exact an excise if any sugar was produced in this country. It was in the knowledge of the House that in the matter of tobacco grown for experimental purposes in Ireland most special exceptions were made. It was thought likely there would be a lucrative crop if firmly established as in the same way sugar beet was regarded in this country, and in order to allow the experiment to be made effectively the Inland Revenue waived its prohibition against the growing of tobacco, and lowered the duty on all Irish-grown tobacco. Would the right hon. Gentleman do the same with regard to the growing of sugar beet?

MR. ASQUITH was understood to say he was quite prepared to do that. At the present time sugar could be grown in this country with perfect safety for experimental purposes. If it were to be grown for commercial purposes he would have to impose an excise. In the case of tobacco in Ireland there was a statutory prohibition which had only lately been got rid of. He thought the Inland Revenue went very far, but the concession was subject to very stringent conditions. It was made for experimental and not for commercial purposes, and if sugar was to be grown in that way he would be prepared to extend the same facilities.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe) said that if this convention was denounced it would be found that the condition of the West Indian Colonies, which had embarked in a vast enterprise in the growing of sugar cane, and incurred considerable outlay, relying on the *bona fide* spirit of this country, would be worse than in the pre-convention days. It seemed to him an extraordinary thing that when there was a question of taking any fiscal step that incidentally would benefit the Colonies without hurting anybody the Government seemed paralysed by some fiscal atrophy. He appealed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to consider the matter in a large-hearted way, and to give our West Indian Colonies some encouragement.

*MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) said the hon. Gentleman who moved this clause, and many of those who supported it, also supported him in the lobby when he moved to abolish the sugar duty. He thought on that occasion they supported him because they desired to see the duty abolished and not merely because they desired to attack the Government. He certainly could not reconcile the two attitudes. At the present time they were arguing in favour of a thing which if it were carried would make impossible that for which they voted the other day. If they got rid of the sugar duty it would be impossible to grant a preference to the Colonies, who would say, "You are depriving us of the preference which you promised us. You are robbing your own flesh and blood." He certainly hoped hon. Members opposite would pause and think a little before they supported this clause. Those who supported the Sugar Convention a few years ago would now find out the result of the revolver practice recommended by Lord Lansdowne. We had fired our revolver, with the result that we had made sugar dearer in this country, and were prevented giving a preference to our Colonies. Hon. Members had evidently forgotten that we had tried the system of preference years ago, and abandoned it in disgust. As recently as 1842 Colonial preferences in sugar were in full force, and in that year we were paying double as much for West Indian sugar as we could buy Brazilian sugar for in the markets of the world. Not only did we not obtain that expansion of the Colonial industries that was now desired by hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite, but the export from the West Indies actually fell in eleven years from 4,000,000 cwts. to 2,500,000 cwts. What happened was that the West Indians got so much for so little that they became lazy, and cultivation instead of being stimulated went down. At the same time our exports to the West Indies declined. It was calculated in 1840 that if our exports to the West Indies were given for nothing and this country had been allowed to buy her sugar in the markets of the world, £1,000,000 a year would have been saved to this country. The abandonment of the system of preferences naturally caused disappointment in the Colonies and would again do so. Soon after their abolition in 1846 a mass meeting was held in Montreal, now one of the most loyal of our Colonies, at which a resolution was passed for annexation with the United States as a punishment to the Mother Country for the fiscal action she had taken. The smaller the tax, the smaller, of course, the effect. He gathered that the argument was that by reducing the duty on Colonial sugar they would reduce the price on the whole volume of sugar supplied.

*SIR FRANCIS LOWE said that was not his contention. He did not consider that the reduction of the duties on Colonial and Home grown sugar would necessarily lower the price to the consumer in the first instance.

*MR. HAROLD COX said there would, in that case, be no benefit to the consumers here, and all the arguments used by hon. Members opposite as to relieving the British consumer were irrelevant. He had rather understood the argument of the mover of the Amendment to be that there would be a general benefit, because if they reduced the tax on a portion of the sugar, to some extent they made a reduction in the price of the whole supply.

*SIR FRANCIS LOWE said that the whole object of Colonial preference was to stimulate trade between us and our Colonies.

*MR. HAROLD COX said he was glad to understand that, but the attitude of hon. Members opposite had been completely changed within the last three or four days. It was now no longer the British consumer, but the Colonial producer they were pleading for. That was a very remarkable change of attitude, and he could only express the hope that hon. Members who wished to be true to their pledges in favour of the abolition of the sugar duty would vote against the Amendment.

*MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) said he wished to enter his caveat against it being assumed as absolutely established that the provisions of the Sugar Convention were a bar to this Amendment. It was quite true that Article 5 of the Convention said that we should charge the lowest rate of duty on the imports from the contracting parties, but that might very well be construed to mean our imports of sugar from foreign countries. That appeared to have been the meaning attached to Article 5 by the framers of the Convention, as would appear from article 11, because there was a curious provision in the protocol which preserved our relations towards imports on Colonial sugar. It was a somewhat obscure reservation embodied in the words giving entire liberty as regarded the fiscal relations between the United Kingdom and its Possessions. The reservation probably meant that so long as it was a question of the action of the Mother Country herself, she was bound by the words of the protocol; but that if and when the Colonies proceeded to move for definition of our fiscal relations with them, we should be considered free under the general, though somewhat obscure reservation in the protocol to which he had referred.

MR. GRETTON asked leave to withdraw the clause.

Motion and clause, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) in moving a new clause to the effect that a landowner farming his own land might be assessed under Schedule D in lieu of Schedules A and B, said he submitted it with the object of raising a question which was referred to during the Committee stage of the Bill. The point of the clause was that a person who invested his money in land was just as much entitled to make his return under Schedule D as was the ordinary business man, and was entitled to be fairly assessed and to obtain relief under the Act just as much as the person who invested his money in business. The effect of the landowner who farmed his own land coming under Schedules A and B was that he really paid the income-tax twice over. He paid it under Schedule A, which represented his capital, regarding the land as capital, and he paid it again under Schedule B in regard to profits arising from farming his land. That, he submitted, was unfair to the person who invested his money in land, because the business man only paid on his net profits which were assessed under Schedule D. The Chancellor of the Exchequer would no doubt tell him that his Unionist predecessors had not seen fit to remedy this state of affairs, and no fresh circumstances had arisen which should cause him to do so; but in his opinion the present Budget had introduced additional features which aggravated the injustice, because, in the first place, it appeared to be pretty evident that the income-tax on unearned income was not likely to go below the rate of 1s. in the £ for a good many years to come; and secondly, by the differentiation between earned and unearned income the Chancellor of the Exchequer had caused people to think whether they were properly assessed, and whether they could not come under the words "earned income" like others. Under Schedule A the landlord was very unfairly assessed, and did not get the same allowances by any means as the person who invested his money in business. That point he had brought up on the Committee stage, and though the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not been very sympathetic to that argument, he had expressed his intention of looking into the matter. So he hoped that if he could not accept the clause to-day, before another Budget statement the right hon. Gentleman would go carefully into this point also in order to see whether the landowner who farmed his own land could not at any rate have the same treatment as the person who invested his money in any kind of business. Large landlords, for some reason or other apparently, were looked upon with disfavour by the Party opposite, but, if his proposal was accepted, people with an income of less than £2,000, who had invested their money in land which they farmed themselves, would benefit. He submitted that these people were worthy of this encouragement just as much as the man who invested his money in any kind of business. The man who farmed his own land spent as much time, money, and energy in that work as did the man in business. If he did not do so his farm would go to ruin and he would certainly lose his money, just as would any man who neglected any other kind of business in which he was engaged. He submitted that this was a case for the indulgence of the House, and that the class for whom he spoke ought at any rate to be put on an equal basis with other classes of people who earned their money in different kinds of businesses. He begged to move.

*CAPTAIN HERVEY (Bury St. Edmunds), in seconding, said he did not see why the landowner farming his own land should not be put upon the same terms as any other business man. At the present time such landowner had to pay under Schedule A on a fixed assessment for landlord's profits, and also under Schedule B, where he farmed his own land, on the profits of farming that land. If he were running a business, he would only have to account under Schedule D for the the actual profit he made. It therefore seemed to him that such landowners ought to be treated on the same lines as those engaged in business concerns. It was well known that in a great many of the light lands farming operations were not a success, and that landlords having at heart the interests of the community amongst which they lived kept these lands tilled even at a loss. It might be said that the landlord farming his own land unsuccessfully could make application for the return of the tax paid under Schedule A. But everybody knew that that was a very cumbersome and difficult operation, and a good deal more trouble than it was worth. Furthermore, if that course were taken in one year, it had to be all gone through the following year. It was much simpler that the people who wished to do the best they could for their land, who were ready to expend large sums in putting up buildings and in keeping the land in good fettle for the benefit of themselves, their neighbours, and the whole community, should come under the same arrangement as any other business man. In all cases where a landlord farmed his own land he ought to be allowed to make his assessment under Schedule D, and not be made to pay under Schedules A and B.

New clause :—

"A landowner farming his own land may be assessed for income-tax under Schedule D in lieu of under Schedules A and B."—(*Mr. Hicks Beach.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. ASQUITH said he had endeavoured to explain in Committee the grounds on which it was impossible to accept this clause. He could not admit that anything he had done this year had made this anomaly more urgent. He had already told the hon. Gentleman who moved the clause that he would very carefully consider the effect of the case he put forward, and if on investigation he satisfied himself that there was a real grievance that he could properly deal with, no prepossession on his part would stand in his way. He thought the hon. Gentleman was content with that assurance; at any rate, he hoped he would be satisfied with it now.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he hoped his hon. friend would be content with that assurance. He did not understand when they had a short discussion on this subject on a previous occasion that the promise made by the right hon. Gentleman applied to this point as well. He thought there was a new reason for considering the matter. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that nothing he had done this year affected the question, but he wished to remind him that the change in the income-tax, by which a differentiation was made between earned and unearned income, did very materially affect the matter, and made the grievance of the landowner farming his own land a very real one. The right hon. Gentleman was going to say to such a landowner that so much as represented interest on capital was unearned, and only so much as represented the reward of his exertions was earned income and assessable at the lower rate. That was to deprive him of relief which was given to the man in an exactly similar position, who invested his money in business instead of in land. The right hon. Gentleman would see that the concessions he had made in the present Budget had introduced a new condition of things, and if there was no reason existing previously for relieving the landowner farming his own land, there was every reason for doing it now. They would be doing a great injustice unless they gave this class of landowners the same relief as they gave to the townsmen.

SIR F. BANBURY said he was not very hopeful of the result of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's consideration of this subject, because the right hon. Gentleman had said that in his opinion there was no grievance. When a landlord farmed his own land he had to put into it capital for live stock and implements, and that capital was not assessed for income-tax unless it made a profit. All they asked was that the landowner farming his own land should be treated in exactly the same way as a man who carried on any other business. If, however, the Chancellor of the Exchequer was prepared to consider the point from the practical point of view, and to deal with it with justice and impartiality, he would ask his hon. friend not to press the clause.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.) said the distinction drawn between earned and unearned income was so fine that it was almost impossible to carry out this proposal. He understood that this question was going to be considered upon its merits, and he hoped the point would be cleared up. He did not at all agree with the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London, when he said that labourers did not work for yeomen as they did for the tenant farmers.

SIR F. CAWLEY (Lancashire, Prestwich) said it seemed a double hardship that a landowner who was farming his own land should have to pay income-tax which he did not earn. A landowner with a farm to let very often took it into his own hands to get it into good condition, and employed more labour, while more often than not he lost money on it. He thought that it should be so arranged that if the landowner made a profit he should pay income-tax on it, but if he did not he should not be called on to pay anything.

MR. HICKS BEACH said that, in view of the Answer given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, he would ask leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Motion and clause, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth) in moving the following clause:—"It shall be lawful for any company registered with limited liability, in estimating the amount of profits chargeable to income-tax, to deduct from such profits the expenses incurred in any issue of debenture or other capital, which expenses have to be, in whole or in part, paid out of the profits of that year," said he wished to draw attention to a grievance which arose when discussions took place before the Commissioners of Inland Revenue as to what deductions should be allowed on these properties. The matter did not arise specially in connection with the present year's Budget, except in so far as it was a fact that there was a tendency more and more to turn business concerns into limited companies, the result being that the question came up more frequently now than before. There were hardly any companies which did not at some time or other make an issue of debentures. If a company was successful, it made an issue of, say, £100,000, and if it was not successful it was equally in need of money, and an issue of debentures was made. In practice the issue of £100,000 of debentures meant a cost of £3,000 or £4,000, but there was no asset representing that amount in the company's funds as shown by the balance sheet. From the other side of the account it appeared that only £96,000 had been received. The auditors naturally said that some provision must be made for the extinction of the £4,000 which represented the cost of issuing the debentures; they said that it must be extinguished over a period of two or three years, or paid off at once, out of profits. If the money was paid out of profits that year, the profits were reduced by that amount, but the Income-tax Commissioners would not allow a deduction in respect of it. That was a grievance which was felt by companies, and when the question came before directors they would scarcely believe that the Commissioners insisted on payment of the assessment on profits which their companies did not receive. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated more than once that it was the grievances which were felt in connection with the assessment of income-tax which were most detrimental to the collection. He understood that the right hon. Gentleman had said that he would consider the whole question as to what should be deducted before profits were arrived at. The case to which attention was now called was one of the most glaring.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER (Liverpool, Everton) in seconding the Amendment, said the expense of an issue of capital was a proper deduction to make in connection with the assessment of income-tax, and it ought to be allowed Though he did not expect the Chancellor of the Exchequer to accept the clause at once, he hoped that this would be one of the items he would allow next year after a careful survey.

New clause—

"It shall be lawful for any company registered with limited liability, in estimating the amount of profits chargeable to income-tax, to deduct from such profits the expenses incurred in any issue of debenture or other capital, which expenses have to be, in whole or in part, paid out of the profits of that year."—(*Mr. Fell.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (MR. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said the question was whether these charges arose in connection with the capital of the company or in connection with its annual profits. His right hon. friend was prepared to consider the question with others with a view to ascertaining whether there was any justification for the demand made. So far, however, as he had looked into it, he did not think there was any justification, because the expenditure referred to was a capital expenditure, and ought not to be deducted from profits. When they raised the subject of debentures they raised at the same time a large number of other matters in connection with which the question arose as to whether the cost ought or ought not to be allowed in assessing income-tax. The Government resisted the Amendment on the ground that this was only one portion of a large question, and that a debenture issue had no particular claim over other issues of the same character.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said it was quite clear that the money spent on raising capital was not an asset of the company. If a man in business unfortunately became bankrupt, he would be told by the Court that the amount of the cost for raising capital should have been deducted, and ought not to have been shown as profits. On the other hand, if the man remained solvent, he was told by the Income-tax Commissioners that the same amount represented profits, and that no deduction could be allowed in respect of it in the assessment for income-tax. If the man was landed in bankruptcy, he might be censured, or perhaps even sent to prison, for showing as profits what he was told he ought to have written off, while, on the other hand, the Income-tax Commissioners would not allow a deduction to be made for the sum because they held that it was profits. He, however, admitted the complication of the subject, and did not desire to secure from the Government anything more at present than an undertaking that they would look into the matter.

Mr. ASQUITH said that no one was more ready than he to admit the difficulties and complications which arose in connection with these matters. Our income-tax legislation had been framed on the plan of saying what deductions should not be allowed, instead of what deductions should be allowed. That he thought led to a great deal of obscurity, and probably to some amount of injustice. This matter was the subject of a legal decision in 1894. He deprecated, as his right hon. friend had said, dealing piecemeal with questions of this kind. It was germane to a number of other questions raised in the course of other debates in Committee, and as to which the real difficulty was in determining what they must do before they arrived at the taxable profit. He thought both hon. Gentlemen had put forward arguments which made the case one worth further consideration, and, if they would be content with his assurance, he would undertake to consider the matter in connection with other points already raised in Committee.

Mr. FELL said that under the circumstances he would withdraw the clause. He might add that it was a matter of increasing importance, and he hoped it would have full consideration.

Motion and clause, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) moved the following clause:—"Incomes of husband and wife shall be added together and divided by two for the purpose of ascertaining the exemption from or abatement of income-tax to which they are respectively entitled." He said that his purpose was to remove not only an admitted anomaly, but also a great injustice and hardship upon a class of people who could ill afford to pay the extra taxation imposed upon them. Before marrying both a man having £400 a year and a woman having £350 a year were entitled to abatements, but after marriage for some anomalous reason their incomes were treated as one, and they were not entitled to any abatement, because the total exceeded £700. There was a case of even greater hardship. A man in receipt of £150 and a woman in receipt of £150 a year, so long as they remained single, were exempt from income-tax, but directly they married they became liable to pay income-tax upon the excess of £160 per annum of their joint incomes. That was a great hardship and gross injustice to people who could ill afford to pay extra taxation. A single man with £150 a year and a single woman with £140 a year were well off compared with a married couple with their joint incomes. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had always refused the Amendment on the ground that previous Chancellors of the Exchequer had taken the same line, and he had said that the expense would be very considerable, though it was difficult to say what it would actually be.

He (Mr. Rawlinson) submitted that that was not a satisfactory argument. It was not absolutely clear that the amount of loss to the Exchequer would be very large. Even if it were as much as had been suggested, he submitted that it was essentially a case where relief of taxation ought to be given. Surely, so far as married couples with limited incomes were concerned, it was a case for relief instead of imposition of taxation. The state of the law as regarded the income of husband and wife had been gradually altering for some forty years, and, whereas forty years ago the incomes of husband and wife were looked upon as one, now under the Married Women's Property Act, they were separated for most purposes. They had, therefore, this anomaly. The Chancellor of the Exchequer took advantage in the death duties that the incomes of husband and wife were not one for all purposes, but for the purposes of the income-tax they were treated as one. He moved the new clause for the purpose not only of removing an anomaly, but also of relieving what he suggested was a great hardship on married couples with limited incomes, both in regard to the question of abatement on higher incomes and total exemption in the case of lesser incomes.

SIR F. BANBURY seconded. It seemed to him that there were no arguments by which the statement of his hon. friend could be met. The only argument which he was evidently afraid would be adduced was that a man and wife were one. He ventured to say that in this case they were not one. In view of the alterations in the law made by the Married Women's Property Act, he thought everyone would agree that if a man with £150 a year married a woman with £140 a year, he would soon find out that they were not one if he tried to take away his wife's income. For the past forty years they had tried to preserve to the woman the right in her own property, and, having done that, they must go a step further, and say there was no reason why she should be prevented from gaining the benefit of exemption from income-tax because she had married a man whose income, added to hers, brought the amount over £160. His hon. and learned friend had said truly that the expenses of a married couple were necessarily larger than the expenses of a single man and a single woman. That was unanswerable and it therefore seemed that they were seeking out people who were desirable of entering into what was always considered an honourable state, and endeavouring to put every possible difficulty in their way of doing so. He thought it would be very hard if the legislation acted as a deterrent to marriage. It was, however, on the ground of the injustice of the present law more than anything else that he appealed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It was most absurd that persons should suddenly lose their exemption because they had got married and their expenses had increased. Under those circumstances he really thought the only argument brought forward against the proposal of his hon. and learned friend was that the Chancellor of the Exchequer might lose a little money. He sympathised with him in that position, and he quite recognised the difficulty of providing the large sum required for the administration of the country, but they must have some regard to justice, and even sacrifice a little money in order to see that no injustice was done to deserving people. They might in this matter have the support of the hon. Members below the gangway, because it could not affect the people so much who had incomes over £700, and they were not laying themselves open to the charge that they were acting in favour of trusts and monopolies. He hoped his hon. friend would go to a division.

New clause—

"Incomes of husband and wife shall be added together and divided by two for the purpose of ascertaining the exemption from or abatement of income-tax to which they are respectively entitled."—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Brought up and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. ASQUITH said that this was a very familiar topic and occurred annually with the same regularity as the Budget itself. He doubted whether the existing law was as serious a deterrent to marriage as the hon. Baronet imagined. He had never come across a couple, young or old, who, animated by a sincere and ardent affection for one another, had been prevented from joining their lots together in life by the fact that their incomes would be aggregated for the purpose of the income-tax. Of all the forms in which this particular Amendment had been presented, that adopted by the hon. and learned Member struck him as being the most peculiar. Under it a husband's income of £999 and a wife's income of £1 would be treated as two incomes of £500, each of which would become entitled to abatement. The proposition was incapable of being defended, and he could hold out no hope of being able to make a concession on the point. All the cases of real hardship were met under the Finance Act of 1897, under which, where the total income did not exceed £500 and was made up partly from profits of business carried on by the wife and partly from business carried on by the husband, the two things were separately assessed. As to the practical consequences to the Exchequer, all the best authorities agreed that the loss would be very considerable indeed, and no Chancellor of the Exchequer had ever felt himself justified in agreeing to it.

Mr. FORSTER (Kent, Sevenoaks) said that possibly there might be good reason for considering whether or not the limit of £500 as it existed at present should be extended so as to cover a total of £700. He did not, however, wish to press the point now, but he hoped the matter would be considered in later years.

Motion and clause, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. RAWLINSON moved a new clause to the effect that incomes which had already paid income-tax in the Colonies should not be liable to be assessed for income-tax in Great Britain. The hon. Member said this proposal had also been brought before the Chancellor of the Exchequer before and argued that it was unjust that an income which had already paid income-tax in the Colonies should also have to pay it here. He would take the case of a man who received an income from South Africa, in which place he had to pay an income-tax. Under the present system he would have to pay income-tax here also; that was to say, he would have to pay it twice over. It was that anomaly that he proposed to remove by the Amendment. Last year the Chancellor of the Exchequer stated that it was a question of expense and the Exchequer could not give up this amount of money. In his judgment, however, the present situation was an unfair one. He begged to move.

Mr. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye) seconded the proposed new clause. Last year he alluded, in connection with this question, to the case of an officer who was at home on furlough and who might be called upon to pay the income-tax—once, say, in India and once in this country. He thought that was a case of hardship which should be met and the new clause of his hon. friend would meet it.

New clause—

"Incomes which have already paid income-tax in the Colonies shall not be liable to be assessed for income-tax in Great Britain."—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Brought up and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. ASQUITH was not able to accept the proposed clause. Since this matter was discussed last year he had had the opportunity of going into the question very thoroughly at the Colonial Conference, in the presence of the Colonial Premiers, including Mr. Deakin and Dr. Jameson, and he was rather disposed to flatter himself that he succeeded in persuading them that it was quite impossible for His Majesty's Government to make any change in the income-tax law in this direction. He did not think the case of the officer came within this provision. He did not know of any such occasion, but if the hon. Gentleman would call his attention to anything of the kind he would consider the matter. The real question had arisen in regard to the De Beers and other South African companies which paid income-tax in Cape

Colony and had also been held liable by the House of Lords to pay income-tax in this country, because they had their registered offices here. He could not agree that any grievance existed as regards individuals. If a man, for reasons of his own, resided in this country and enjoyed the protection of our laws, it was only fair that in consideration of that voluntary act on his part, and the Government protection extended to him, he should contribute income-tax on the whole of his income, wheresoever that income arose. That was the root principle which went to the basis of the whole matter and he could not recede from it.

SIR SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central) said, in supporting the Amendment, that anybody in this country who bought rupee paper had the English income-tax deducted by the person who cashed it, and he also had to pay the Indian income-tax. As he had to pay the charge here, he could not understand why he should also have to pay it in India.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER also supported the Amendment, and said the question was worthy of consideration in regard to both individuals and companies. He knew of one case where the whole of the trade of the company was done in a colony and all the shareholders except 10 per cent. resided there, and yet because the company had a registered office here, while its property was in Natal, they had to pay income-tax here. Therefore it seemed to be against the interests of the company to be registered here and to have an office where only office and secretarial work and the work of distribution was carried on. The question was quite as important to a company as to an individual.

MR. ASQUITH said it was only where a company found it worth while to keep its head centre here in England that it became liable to pay income-tax out of the whole of its profits; when a company was substantially controlled and directed in a colony or foreign country income-tax was only payable on that part of the profits which was remitted.

SIR F. BANBURY said he agreed with the Chancellor of the Exchequer in regard to this matter. If a company carried on business abroad and had an establishment here he thought there was no hardship in its having to pay income-tax.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he agreed with his hon. friend who had just spoken, and hoped that his hon. and learned friend who had moved the new clause would not press it to a division. The contribution which a company made for income-tax in this country and in the Colonies, although it was no doubt collected on the same income, was paid in respect of two services, because the company had interests in two places. Where a company contributed to the expenditure of a Colony in regard to a business carried on there that was no reason why they should not pay income-tax in this country for a different service.

MR. FELL drew attention to the fact pointed out by Sir Joseph Ward at the recent Conference that travellers to New Zealand who were domiciled here and resided in New Zealand for a sufficient time to become assessable there in regard to income-tax invariably protested on the ground that income-tax had already been paid in England. He suggested that there should be some reciprocal arrangement between the Mother-country and the Colonies in the matter. It was very hard that such persons should pay income-tax twice over. The question of charging companies income-tax also raised a most important point. He believed that if companies were assessed for income-tax the revenue would suffer. The De Beers' Company, for instance, would have to pay both here and at Cape Colony on all their profits, and he saw from a statement in the papers that they proposed to remove their London office to New York in order to avoid that. They would never get a company to pay income-tax twice over in two countries on the same income, and the result, if it was attempted, would be that other companies like De Beers would close their London offices.

MR. LEVERTON HARRIS (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) said the law at present seemed rather anomalous. As he understood, a company which had its head office in the country where it carried on its business and an office in this country had to pay income-tax in both countries. But he could imagine a company for the purpose of evading the income-tax using an office in a colony and doing all its business in this country through an agency. The agency would then pay all the profits over to the office in the Colony, which would divide them among the shareholders, who would then pay no income-tax at all. He did not know whether this question arose out of the new clause, but he thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer should endeavour to insist upon foreign and Colonial companies paying the same income-tax as was imposed on the English companies with which they competed.

Question put, and negatived.

Mr. COURTHOPE moved the following clause:—"All death or succession duties payable in respect of land shall be payable, wholly or in part, in land which shall be valued at the assessment at which it was assessed for the purposes of such duties before any deductions whatsoever were made from such assessment." He said that the proposal was introduced in a more elaborate form by the right hon. Member for Wimbledon in 1894, and the lack of argument against the proposal adduced by Sir William Harcourt on that occasion was somewhat remarkable. Unless the present Chancellor of the Exchequer had some more pertinent argument to bring against it, he should, he thought, be justified in pressing the clause to a division. It was not a good argument to compare the death duty to a debt to one's butcher or baker. The death duty on landed estates should be dealt with as a definite charge on the land, and not as a personal charge on the individual who happened to inherit the land. At the present time it was very difficult to raise money on agricultural land, and an individual with no large means of his own who inherited a landed estate would undoubtedly experience great difficulty in raising sufficient to meet the death and succession duties, and the result might be a forced sale of the most disastrous character. He thought the Government might meet this state of things by allowing a portion of the land to be handed over to them at the amount at which it was assessed for death duties. Such a thing would be particularly desirable at the present time, when they were complaining of the difficulty of obtaining land for small holdings. He would suggest to hon. Members who were in favour of the nationalisation of the land that it would be a good opportunity for them, because the proposal would tend inevitably to decrease the size and increase the number of holdings on estates, which would enable land to be more easily bought and sold. It would certainly place a great deal of extra land at the disposal of His Majesty's Government for allotments and small holdings or other purposes. It was objected that his clause contained no elaborate provision for assessing the value of the land. He thought it did. The mere fact of its assessment to the death duties was security in the long run both to the Crown and the individual, and he thought it would be very rare that any injustice would be done to either. He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be able to give this proposal more favourable consideration than was given to it by his predecessor in 1894, and if he was not able to entertain it from the Government's point of view, that he would adduce more serious arguments against it than had already been offered.

Sir F. BANBURY in seconding the new clause, said he thought it an excellent one, though it ought to have a provision which would leave it open to the executors to pay either in money or in land. When the clause had been read a second time, however, an Amendment could be submitted to that effect, and he hoped his hon. friend would accept it. He thought this proposal ought to appeal to hon. Members below the gangway opposite. One hon. Member opposite had said that there was nothing more unfair than the manner in which land was assessed for the death duties—that the land was taken on exceptionally favourable terms, and that the valuation put upon it was very much below what it ought to be. He did not agree with him; but if it were so it was a very strong reason for his supporting the Amendment, because, the State would obtain payment not only quickly and without trouble, but in a way which would render that payment, when it was received, very much more valuable to the State than if it were made in a lump sum down, the land would be very much more valuable than the nominal amount at which it was assessed. That seemed to him an unanswerable reason why hon. Gentlemen below the gangway opposite should support the clause. On the whole the valuation of the land was taken very fairly; if it erred, it was in the contrary direction—that was to say, that the valuation was higher than the real value of the land, and that made it difficult for people to sell their land in a hurry. For instance, a property might be worth £20,000, or £30,000 or £50,000; but they could not realise that at once; it might be two or three years before they could find a purchaser. Unless this clause was passed, the unfortunate heir would have to borrow money in order to provide for the death duties. It would be difficult to borrow money on a landed estate if they were to have much more of the legislation which was desired by hon. Gentlemen opposite. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had made reassuring statements in the City, but he did not think the right hon. Gentleman's followers had done enough to justify those statements, because they were still pursuing their predatory legislation in the Grand Committees. He thought, in view of this, that it was very necessary that some facilities such as were foreshadowed in the new clause should be granted to those people who were unfortunate enough to succeed to property in land. Supposing the land was over-valued, the State would benefit; if, on the other hand, the land was properly valued, then nobody would be hurt; and, if the land was under-valued, owing to the legislation of hon. Gentlemen opposite, then they would suffer, and he would say, "Serve them right." The Chancellor of the Exchequer, he understood, was getting better terms under the existing system than he would obtain if the clause was carried. It might be that the State was making rather more than it ought out of the valuations as at present conducted; but if that were so, he was sure that the Chancellor of the Exchequer did not want to take advantage of the unfortunate person who succeeded to a property which he found it difficult to realise, and on which he already had to pay a heavy duty. The right hon. Gentleman would not desire to mulct him to a greater degree than was contemplated by the law when it was first established, and therefore the scrupulous way was to take over the land itself at the valuation given. He would suggest to his hon. friend that there should be the option to pay either in cash or in land, for there were a good many people desirous of retaining properties because they were ancestral or in desirable positions, or for other reasons, and he was sure his hon. friend would not desire to prevent their doing that. On the understanding that such an Amendment would be accepted, he seconded the clause.

New clause—

"All death or succession duties payable in respect of land shall be payable, wholly or in part, in land which shall be valued at the assessment at which it was assessed for the purposes of such duties before any deductions whatsoever were made from such assessment."—(*Mr. Courthope.*)

Brought up and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this clause be read a second time."

MR. ASQUITH said the subject of this clause was last brought forward in 1894, when it seemed to have been lightly brushed aside by the late Sir William Harcourt, and he did not recollect its having again appeared since. It was quite impossible for him to accept the clause in any shape or form. It was absolutely without precedent, so far as he was aware, in the whole of our legislation, that a man should pay his taxes in kind. And not only that, but the clause now proposed was compulsory in its terms. It said that the duties "shall" be payable in land; it was an absolutely mandatory clause; it did not even give the wretched executor a chance of paying in money. They were not in the habit of receiving taxes in kind, either in land or in any other form. As the proposal would work out, the taxpayers could go about their estates, and pick out a little bit of land here, or a bit there, to be handed over to whom? He did not know. Who was it to be vested in, the Crown, the Prime Minister, or the Chancellor of the Exchequer? They were entirely in the dark. It was to be handed over to some person who represented the State, and a nice job that person would have. He would have cast upon his hands isolated bits of land, of which he would have to make the best he could in the interests of the country. It was really not a proposition on which he ought to detain the House, but he could assure them that every payment of death duties on land would be equitable, fair, and easy. He could not possibly accept the clause.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said he was the last person to deny that the clause could not be accepted in this particular form, but they were only on the Second Reading of it, and not on the details, and the right hon. Gentleman had referred rather more to the general principle than to the details of his hon. friend's proposal. He was not going into the general question. The case for a clause of this kind had strengthened since 1894. There had been legislation in favour of increasing the number of small holdings, schemes for the compulsory acquisition of land, and the old views had been widely departed from. According to the modern ideas held by many Members, the value of land was perpetually to increase under the force of social laws, and the benefits that thereby accrued to the landowner should belong to the community generally. Land, unlike any other property, was peculiarly susceptible to State ownership, according to the opinion of many of the Government supporters, and he could not understand why the Government should not seize the opportunity for increasing State ownership of land. He quite agreed it might be inexpedient to compel a Government to take the tax in this form, and would recommend the leaving open of a voluntary arrangement. Peculiar difficulties stood in the way of those who had to pay death duties, and he did not know how the Inland Revenue would deal with property which had been reduced in value by various legislative projects, but surely it would be well to allow this silent voluntary method of transfer agreeable to owners. Those were some of the grounds which did not exist to the same degree when this subject was discussed in 1894, and he ventured to say that they constituted a real reason why the clause should be read a second time, so that the details of it might be dealt with later. He did not associate himself with the particular terms of the clause, but if it was pressed to a division he should certainly support it on the distinct grounds not that this special proposal was one which the House ought to accept, but because it was one which deserved a Second Reading, taking into account all the new conditions which, according to the majority now ruling, ought to govern the relations between this House and landed property.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN drew a distinction between the words in the clause "shall be payable" and a mandatory declaration "shall be paid."

*Mr. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs), in supporting the Amendment, said it gained force in view of what was going on in the Scottish Grand Committee. It was clear to all that great difficulties would in the future confront the landowner, who had to sell land for the purpose of paying duty in many cases. He would have to accept a diminished price, and in many cases would have difficulty in attracting any price at all. Moreover, he could not sell his feu duties as the danger and risk of a future taxation of feu duties rendered that difficulty greater. It was true that the Prime Minister had said that it was no part of the policy of the Government to rate feu duties for local purposes, but he had never said that he did not propose to tax them for Imperial purposes.

Mr. WYNDHAM (Dover) pointed out that the difficulty in the way of carrying out schemes for creating small holdings or providing houses was that of borrowing money for the purpose, and the acceptance of this proposal or some modification of it might prove most useful to an embarrassed Exchequer. The fundamental difficulty was that of getting anybody to lend money on such terms as would enable small holdings to be established at a profit. He thought if the Government could see their way to accept this emendation of their proposal they would do a great deal to relieve that difficulty. When a landowner had to borrow money on his estate to pay the death duties he came into the money market and had to compete against the Government. Consequently, by accepting this proposal the Government would be killing two birds with one stone.

MR. PARKER (Halifax) said that much as they desired to obtain land the Labour Members felt they had no wish to have small patches here and there in estates all over the country. He did not pretend to discuss the difficulties of those who succeeded to big estates, but whatever those difficulties might be it was ridiculous to suggest that the Chancellor should take the duties in kind. Whether it was seriously meant he did not know. Probably it was not. They might as well propose that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should on the death of a whisky distiller go to the distillery and take the duties out in whisky. Certainly hon. Members below the gangway would not vote for this clause.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 65; Noes, 275. (Division List No. 284.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood,RtHn.Sir Alex.F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.SirH.
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,RtHn.A.J.(City Lond.)
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beach,Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish,Rt.Hon.Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham
Collings,Rt.Hn.J.(Birmingham
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim, S.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Forster, Henry William
Gretton, John
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.Sir JohnH.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood,Rt.Hn. Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morpeth, Viscount
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Roberts,S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W.Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col.W.H. (Lancashire)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B.Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Courthope and Sir Frederick Banbury.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.HonHerbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow,Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone,N.
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romford
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hon.SydneyCharles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras W.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold

Craig,Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, David(Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,RtHn.Sir W.Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey,W.E. (Derbyshire,N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, D. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M. (Aberdeen,W.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Jackson, R. S.
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appreby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, EdmundG.(Leominster
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A.Levy(Essex,Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down,S.)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mond, A.
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Grady, J.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parkes, Ebenezer
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs Leek)
Pearson, W.H.M.(Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, C.E.(Edinburgh,Central)
Price,Robert John (Norfolk,E.)
Priestley,W.E.B. (Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Richards,T.F.(Wolverhampton
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley,Hn.A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,SirEdward(Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E.
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton,Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

MR. ASQUITH moved an addition to Clause 8 in order to carry out a promise which he gave when the Bill was in Committee.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 28, at the end, to insert the words '(3) Section eleven of The Finance Act, 1899 (which relates to policies of insurance in respect of injury to workmen), shall be read as if two pounds were substituted for one pound as the amount of the annual premium therein mentioned.—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted,"—put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, to leave out Clause 9."—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Question, "That Clause 9 stand part of the Bill," Question put, and negatived.

The following Amendments were proposed by Mr. Asquith and agreed to—

"In page 3, line 39, to leave out the word 'passing,' and to insert the word 'commencement.'"

"In page 4, line 18, after the word 'the,' to insert the word 'loan.'"

"In page 4, line 24, after the word 'existing,' to insert the word 'loan.'"

"In page 6, line 3, at the end, to insert the words 'Provided that if as respects any such deduction the person by whom the duty is payable requires the Commissioners, on the first delivery of his account, to calculate the deduction as if this section had not passed, the deduction shall be so calculated.'"

"In page 8, line 33, after the word 'claim,' to insert the words 'for relief under this section.'"—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

MR. ASQUITH moved the insertion of words in Clause 20 for the purpose of giving effect to promises made in Committee with respect to the relief to be granted to persons in receipt of pensions. The joint effect of the Amendments was to include "compensation for loss of office" in the expression "earned income," and to bring in under the same expression pensions enjoyed by widows and children.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 20, page 9, line 11, at beginning, to insert the words 'any income arising in respect of.'"—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*MR. MORTON (Sutherland) said that as he understood the question, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had promised that all pensions, whether any contribution was made towards them by annual deduction or not, should be considered as earned incomes. That promise he had carried out by the proposed Amendments, and he (Mr. Morton) desired to thank him for the way in which he had met them.

*MR. SMEATON (Stirlingshire) said he was afraid the clause as now amended by the right hon. Gentleman did not cover the case of a pension to a family towards which a deceased husband or parent had contributed. He had an Amendment in manuscript, to insert after the second word "profit" the following: "Where the individual or the——

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member should wait until he reaches that point of the Amendments to be proposed and then raise his Amendment.

MR. RAWLINSON said that he also had an Amendment which arose on that same question, viz., the case where a person had been in the employment, say, of a railway company and got from that company a pension towards which he himself had contributed.

*MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member will wait till that Amendment is reached he will then have an opportunity of discussing it.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, on a point of order, asked if it would not be more convenient for the House to take something like a general discussion of the subsection as the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed to amend it. It was very difficult to follow the exact effect of the insertion of each of these Amendments as they went along, and might very easily be that they would pass the point at which the amending words ought to be introduced.

*MR. SPEAKER said he thought it was better to wait until they reached a further stage of the Amendments.

MR. ASQUITH said the point raised by the hon. Member for Stirlingshire and the hon. Gentleman opposite had been carefully borne in mind, and the words were drawn up in such a way, he was advised, as particularly to cover that case.

***MR. SMEATON** asked if he was now in order in speaking with regard to his Amendment.

***MR. SPEAKER**: I still recommend the hon. Member to wait. I will call upon him when we reach the point in the Bill where his Amendment comes in.

Question put, and agreed to.

The following Amendments were also agreed to:—

"In page 9, line 12, to leave out the word 'including,' and to insert the words 'or in respect of.'"

"In page 9, line 13, after the word 'superannuation,' to insert the words 'or other.'"

"In page 9, line 13, to leave out the word 'or.'"

"In page 9, line 13, after the word 'pay,' to insert the words 'or compensation for loss of office, given.'"

"In page 9, line 14, after the word 'of,' to insert the word 'the.'"—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 9, line 14, after the word 'services,' to insert the words 'of the individual or the husband or parent of the individual.'"—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central) thought that the right hon. Gentleman had hardly carried out the whole of the promise he understood him to have made and which was contained, he thought, in the Motion of the hon. Member for Stirlingshire. He said he would extend his generosity to the widows and children of pensioners, as he understood, either of the Army or Civil Service. But the Amendment now proposed did not really carry that promise out in any way whatever. He would be very glad to be told he was wrong. He thought that for nearly every pension enjoyed by a widow or a child of a member of the services, either military or civil, that member had paid during the whole period of his service or had had to contribute to a specific fund. It was from that source that the pension was derived, and he was afraid the income-tax authorities if they followed the strict sense of the words of the Amendment would find in some cases that it was not in connection with services but in connection with savings. He would be glad if the right hon. Gentleman corrected him, but he was most anxious to see that the pensions of the widows and children of military officers and civilians in the employ of India should be treated as earned income.

MR. ASQUITH said they were not dealing merely with India, but with all sorts of pensions for all kinds of services, to the State, to the railways, or anything else; all classes were to be put exactly on the same footing. There was no pension of any sort which was not in respect of services. A pension was given in respect of services, not in respect of a man's contribution, although that might be in some measure the amount of his pension. These Amendments were for the purpose of giving the widest possible fulfilment of the pledge he gave in Committee on the Bill.

***SIR J. JARDINE** (Roxburghshire), speaking as a former secretary and manager of the Bombay Civil Service Fund, said that on appointment to the Indian Civil Service an officer was required to enter into a covenant that he would subscribe to a superannuation fund for officers and a pension fund for widows and children, and he did both from the moment he arrived at Bombay until he retired from that service, and while a bachelor and afterwards. When he married he had to pay an increased subscription to provide a pension for his widow, if he ever had one, and as soon as any children were born a separate subscription had to be paid for them, and if in the interval he died, what he had paid in lapsed into the fund and did not go to the benefit of his heirs. It might possibly be contended that the pension he was providing in that way for widows and children originated in the covenant and thus was separate from that which was awarded at the end of his service for his own services and to keep him going after he had retired. He thought those facts were not generally known—the fact of the lapsing of the payments which were made into the general funds so that his heirs got no value for them if he died, the fact that if he was a bachelor all his life what he had paid towards that contingent potential liability, namely a widow, also lapsed, and that if his children died the same thing happened to what he had paid for them.

*MR. SMEATON said there had been a doubt expressed as to whether the clause as amended covered the case of a contribution by the deceased pensioner towards a pension for his widow and family.

*MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member will only have a little patience, I will call upon him when we reach the point where his Amendment comes in.

Question put, and agreed to.

The following Amendments were also agreed to—

"In page 9, line 14, to leave out the word 'that,' and to insert the word 'any.'"

"In page 9, line 14, after the word 'employment,' to insert the words 'of profit.'"

"In page 9, line 16, to leave out the word 'such.'"—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

*MR. SMEATON said he apologised for his anxiety about this clause, but this was the last and only opportunity of clearing up a doubtful matter, and he hoped the House would grant him their indulgence. The only reason he had for proposing those extra words was because of a doubt not only felt by laymen, but even by lawyers as to whether this new clause covered the case of a contribution of a deceased pensioner towards the allowance to his widow and family. If the right hon. Gentleman could give an assurance that he would instruct the Inland Revenue Office that such was the proper construction of the clause, he would be quite prepared to withdraw his Amendment. His suggested Amendment was "to add, after the second word 'profit,' the words 'whether the individual, or the husband or parent of the individual, shall have contributed to such pension, superannuation allowance, or deferred pay or not.'" The only reason he had in putting forward the Amendment was to make perfectly clear that the intention of the right hon. Gentleman was expressed in terms about which no possible doubt or dispute could arise.

*MR. ASQUITH considered the Amendment was unnecessary. In conjunction with the Revenue officers he had chosen a form of words which he thought completely covered the case made by the hon. Member who had just spoken.

MR. RAWLINSON asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer if he could not see his way to make absolutely clear what was his expressed intention. He had the greatest faith in his own opinion and he asked the right hon. Gentleman to adopt one of the Amendments on the Paper to make the matter clear. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would accept the hon. Member's Amendment.

*MR. ASQUITH said that of course, if the hon. Gentleman entertained any doubt as to the construction of the clause as he proposed to amend it, he would accept the words suggested. If he thought there was a shadow of doubt upon the question he would do so, especially as this was the last occasion on which they could effectively amend the framework of the Bill.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.) rose to protest against the tone adopted by the Chancellor of the Exchequer towards his hon. friend whose suggestion he had pooh-poohed and afterwards accepted at the instance of the hon. and learned Gentleman. Those who were interested in the freedom of debate were not prepared to allow the Chancellor of the Exchequer to set himself up as an infallible pope in these matters.

MR. RAWLINSON thanked the Chancellor of the Exchequer for his great courtesy and said, although he agreed with him in his construction of the sentence, he thought it might he construed by the Courts in a different way. He did not like to take the risk of letting the clause go through as it stood, and although he agreed with the Chancellor of the Exchequer's view he thought if he could see his way to adopt the Amendment to the Amendment it would do no harm and make things clearer.

Mr. ASQUITH said that after the speech to which they had just listened he would accept the Amendment.

Mr. SMEATON expressed his thanks for the great courtesy which the right hon. Gentleman had shown him.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FELL moved to add as a new subsection the following words "(*d*) Any annuity which has been purchased out of savings from income derived from the exercise of any trade, profession, or vocation." He thought that annuities purchased out of earned income should be treated favourably in the manner he suggested. It was more difficult for a man himself to save money out of his income and invest it than it was for a man in a situation where a certain portion of his income was deducted perforce by his employer and invested for him. Therefore he assumed that the right hon. Gentleman would do his best for persons possessed of such annuities in order that he might safeguard savings of this kind. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would include them in the same category as pensions for long and faithful service and deal with them as earned incomes. He begged to move.

Sir F. BANBURY, in seconding, said a similar Amendment was moved in the Committee stage, when he pointed out to the Chancellor of the Exchequer that unless he accepted some such Amendment as this he would inflict a great hardship on a certain class. He did not blame the House for safeguarding pensions received for civil, military, naval, or other services. He thought all pensions should be safeguarded, and that if a man was in receipt of an income of under £2,000 a year he was entitled to the benefits of the clause. But if those persons were entitled to these benefits professional men and those engaged in trade or commerce were doubly entitled. The Indian civil servant in receipt of £1,500 or £2,000 a year knew that so long as he did his work he would receive his income; he need not put by anything because the State was putting it by for him. On the other hand, the struggling barrister, the doctor, or other professional man had perhaps a small capital embarked in a profession in which there was enormous competition. He might make £600 one year, and the next, owing to illness or some other circumstance over which he had no control, he might earn only £300 or £400 or he might make no profit at all. If by great assiduity and hard work he at last succeeded in making a small competence, and out of that competence he put something by for old age, he had to exercise a great amount of self-denial. Everybody regarded a man who exercised such self-denial, and out of the money he had earned put by something as a provision against bad times and old age, as a man who did a great service to the State. What sort of a reward for that man was it if, after the exercise of that self-denial and thrift, having purchased an annuity of £1,000 a year, he had to pay 1s. in the £ income-tax, whilst the civil servant who had had a much easier time and had not to exercise that quality of self-denial was at once met by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and allowed this deduction? If the right hon. Gentleman had said that such men as these were to be exempt and that the civil servants were not he would have thought it hard, but that on the whole the right hon. Gentleman had done the right thing; but as it was, unless the right hon. Gentleman accepted this Amendment, he had done the wrong thing. He had favoured a class already favoured to the exclusion of a class equally deserving. He, however, recognised the fact that the right hon. Gentleman desired to do what was fair and so far as possible to put everybody on an equal footing. But he desired to point out that it would be very difficult to justify the selection for this benefit of a class which had had by far the easier time. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to accept the Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 9, line 24, at the end, to insert the words '(d) any annuity which has been purchased out of savings from income derived from the exercise of any trade, profession, or vocation.'"—(*Mr. Fell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

MR. ASQUITH reminded the House that this matter was fully discussed in Committee, and he declined, for the reasons he gave then, to accept the Amendment. An annuity was a form of investment, and who was to tell from what source any particular investment had been derived? He admitted that pensions were an exception or an excrescence upon the scheme, but he found it impossible to make an exception in favour of annuities, which were only one form of investment.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he failed to see the distinction in point of principle or equity between pensions and annuities, though he quite understood the administrative difficulties. The Chancellor, having admitted pensions, had no longer a logical principle to stand upon, the governing consideration being, not the equity or inequity of the claim, but the convenience or inconvenience of the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

And, it being a quarter-past Eight of the Clock, and there being Private Business set down by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

LEITH BURGH ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL (BY ORDER).

Read a second time.

*MR. J. M. HENDERSON (Aberdeenshire, W.) moved, "That this Bill be referred to a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons." He said he did not desire to burden the House with the details and merits of this question, which was whether the 9th Section of the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act was to be operative. The House was conversant with private Bill procedure, and knew that either party had the right of going before a second Committee for a hearing. But under the Scottish procedure they had no right to a second hearing except by leave of the House. What took place in this case was that after the Bill was submitted to the Commissioners, four in number, drawn from a panel under the terms of Section 4 of the Act, and inclusive of Members of both Houses, a local inquiry was held in Edinburgh last April, and counsel and witnesses were heard for [a period extending over three days. As to the decision of the preamble of the Bill the four Commissioners were unanimous on all points except one, and on that point they were equally divided. On that point the petitioners asked that the Confirmation Bill should be remitted to a Joint Committee of both Houses as provided by the Act. The Procedure Act provided that the chairman should have a casting vote in the case of an equal division of opinion. He did not suggest that the chairman in this case did anything but what was right; he did not suggest that there was any partisanship or partisan spirit manifested in this decision; it could not be so because in all cases except this one the Commissioners were unanimous. But it was a very serious matter that one man's vote should alter the whole of a procedure which was very nearly a century old. The 9th Section of the Act would appear to him to be a dead letter unless it applied to a case of this kind. In an ordinary private Bill the parties had the right to a rehearing, and surely a Scottish private Bill should not be deprived of the right which the parties to all other Private Bills possessed whether for or against. It did not seem to him to be doing any great favour to Scotland to give it a special Act for its procedure on Private Bills if this were the case. A legal decision in any Court of law, or indeed in most commercial matters, where there was an equality of votes, was that the *status quo ante* obtained. It was so in a Court of law, and it was so in any case where there was a serious matter such as this involved. What they had to do in this instance was to show that there was a *prima facie* case for the reconsideration of the matter. The petition set forth a very serious case for substantial inquiry. The Dock Commission for very nearly a hundred years had been under an Act of Parliament which freed them from assessments to certain rates. They did their own policing; they had about two and a half miles of roads outside of the docks which they maintained, paying men to do the work, for which a rate would have had to be made. The Dock Commission were free from the rate not out of charity but as a *quid pro quo* under a certain Act of Parliament. Effort after effort had been made to get rid of that position, and to bring them subject to the rate, but effort after effort had failed. They were told that railway companies were subject to the same rates, but railways belonged to private owners and were run for profit. This dock company had no shareholders to whom it paid dividend; it was a public body which carried on a public work for the public benefit; it was outside the ranks of private companies earning and paying dividend to shareholders. They were told that other docks had to pay these rates, and no doubt they had, but other dock companies had not to pay what this Dock Commission had to pay. They had to pay the cost of policing, lighting, cleansing and maintaining roadways, together with about two miles and a half of roadways outside of the dock, out of dock revenues. The annual cost was about £11,500. The Dock Commission had actually half as many policemen as the whole of Leith itself; it had forty odd police, while the rest of Leith had ninety odd police. The dock revenue also paid the poor and school rates, and a number of minor rates, amounting with the public health rate to £9,000, with, in addition, the property and income-tax, say £3,000; that was to say, they subscribed £23,600 for local purposes. Further than that, their revenues, the estimates of which were grossly exaggerated, were burdened with a capital debt of £247,000, representing the redemption price of other public burdens placed on the dock revenues. These burdens were annuities of £8,000 a year for public purposes, while the yearly service for the redemption of the debt was £11,000 a year. Originally this dock did not belong to Leith at all; it belonged to Edinburgh; Leith had nothing to do with it; Leith never subscribed a penny piece to put the dock there; it had never subscribed a shilling for any policing or cleansing that went on in the place. What was the position? It had got an indebtedness for building other docks of £800,000. How was that money raised? How could they raise any money of that kind unless they satisfied the investor that he had a large margin to come upon as security for his so lending? This £800,000, with which were built the last docks, was borrowed on the faith of the Act of Parliament which gave these Dock Commissioners immunity from this rate. It would be a breach of faith that this additional taxation should be put upon them for work which they did themselves. He said, without going into the merits of the case, that the mere fact of there having been a division of opinion and a vote of two and two should at least form a ground for further consideration before a Joint Committee, as he moved. Every burden that they placed on the Dock Commissioners would be just so much off their power to be of practical use. Let the House remember that there was great competition with foreign docks, and unless the English and the Scottish docks could keep themselves up to the mark by giving rebates, which were so considerably reducing the incomes, unless they could keep up every improvement and every facility, all of which were supplied with borrowed money, their dock business would go down. Every shilling which these Commissioners made was not put into their own pockets, but was used for developing the docks and in helping to draw the commerce of the world to Leith. He said advisedly that it was foolish for the town of Leith and for the corporation of Leith to try and harrass the Dock Commissioners, and to try to put additional burdens upon them. If the dock business were to go down and were to be lost, where would Leith be? It would become a wilderness. Everything possible ought to be done to increase the trade of the port instead of injuring and harassing it. He begged to move the Motion standing in his name.

*MR. W. R. REA (Scarborough) seconded the Motion. He did so in the first place on the grounds presented to the Committee which sat in Edinburgh, and secondly, on the general principle which underlay their decision. This proposal was to some extent the result of a quarrel between one municipality and the successors of another municipality. These docks were originally built by the city of Edinburgh, and the present Dock

Commissioners were not a profit-making company but the lineal successors of the Edinburgh Council, who were responsible for the making of these docks in the first instance. These Commissioners succeeded to the functions of the town council in that they lighted, cleansed, and maintained the roadways in the dock estate. Under this Bill it was proposed that not only should the dock authority maintain these services which were usually maintained by the municipality, but they were also to pay the ordinary rates to which the ratepayers in another category altogether were subjected. That was *prima facie* an unfair position in which to put this particular authority. This authority had been put to some exceptional charges, amounting to about £8,000 annually, and any such increase in the burdens placed upon the dock must inevitably fall upon the traders and upon the trade of the country in general. After all, Leith owed its prosperity to these docks, and it was a mere suburb of Edinburgh. Consequently there would be a considerable risk if the dues had to be raised to such an extent that shipowners would be obliged to transfer their trade to some other port. The question had also a national bearing. At the present time they heard a good deal about foreign competition. The shipping trade was carried on under some great disabilities on account of foreign competition. When foreign ports were being fostered and supported by foreign nations, and every care taken that undue burdens should not be placed upon shipping, the House should pause before authorising a scheme which would upset a situation which had existed for over seventy years. Not only so, but the scheme would establish a precedent which might be followed by other local authorities having docks within their area, and that might very seriously affect the shipping trade of the United Kingdom at a time when it needed fair play. He associated himself with the desire which had been expressed to effect whatever reduction was possible in the cost of Private Bill legislation, but thought the House should consider very carefully before, under the Private Bill procedure of Scotland, it allowed a decision which had been in force for seventy years to be upset in this manner. That decision had not been arrived at without grave consideration. The local authorities of Leith had made, on four occasions, efforts to upset the arrangement which had been in force since 1838, and in every instance they had been defeated. Under this peculiar procedure a Joint Committee representing the two Houses sat in Edinburgh to hear evidence and a decision was arrived at, not unanimously, but by the casting vote—which was the second vote—of the Chairman of that Committee. He had every confidence in the Joint Committee of both Houses, but there were questions of principle which he submitted should not be settled by Committees of either House of Parliament sitting at a distance from London, and one of those questions was that a principle which had been in existence for seventy years consistently ought not to be upset by the casting vote of the Chairman. He asked the House to reconsider the matter. If the subject had been heard before a Court of law and there had been such a division of opinion as occurred before the Committee which investigated this question in Edinburgh, the Court would have decided in favour of maintaining the *status quo*. They ought to consider the matter very carefully before they decided to allow a divided Committee to upset a decision which had been in force for seventy years. It was a very technical question and there was a vast amount of evidence, but, fortunately, under the procedure of these Private Bills in Scotland there was a method by which such difficulties as had arisen in regard to this measure could be remedied. Under the Scottish Private Bill procedure, if objection were taken to the Provisional Order Confirmation Bill, or should there be a petition against it, then it was open to the House to refer the whole matter to a Joint Committee of both Houses, which might again hear the evidence and decide the matter upon its merits in such a manner that the authority which he represented would feel that, although they might not get all they desired, they had received a fair hearing and they could not say that the matter had been settled over their heads. It was on those grounds, without asking hon. Members to prejudge the case, that he invited the House to justify the clause in the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, which enabled them to refer the matter to a Standing Committee of both Houses by supporting this Resolution.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be referred to a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons.'"—(*Mr. J. M. Henderson.*)

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs) said he must ask the House to reject this proposal. If, as had been argued by the hon. Member who had just sat down, this question ought to be decided upon general principles surely the House ought to pass the Second Reading and not refer the Bill to a Committee at all. Questions of general principle could not possibly enter into the question of the recommittal of this measure. The allowance of half-rates was a compromise, because the burgh of Leith thought the authority ought to pay full rates. With regard to the Private Bill Procedure for Scotland most hon. Members representing Scotland would rather strengthen that system than weaken it. He contended that no case had been made out for a rehearing before a Committee. The question of the omnibus came up because one of the parties in the case had been refused a *locus standi*, and a rehearing was granted. But the decision was reaffirmed and no change was made. The only result was that it involved considerable additional cost, and that was the real objection to the rehearing of cases. If there were many rehearings they would knock the whole of the Private Bill procedure system on the head. It would make the new system of procedure far more costly than the old. The Committee was composed of Members of both Houses of Parliament. It had a chairman who was experienced in business and in local affairs, and the case had a careful hearing. The Committee sat for five days, and its decisions were unanimous, save on the one point of the half of the burgh rates. The liability for half of the burgh rates was carried by the Chairman's casting vote. The point now raised was that, the Chairman having given a casting vote, the decision was practically valueless. But how could they get on without the casting vote? It was necessary to business. The hon. Member for West Aberdeenshire contended that the casting vote, if it was used at all, should be used to maintain the *status quo*. He could give an excellent example of how that system worked. There was a parish near which he lived in Scotland where that procedure was adopted, and the consequence was that no business was done in the parish for more than a year. He had to go on the council to remedy that state of matters, and the proceedings had been since gone about by his casting vote, and he did not see how business was to be conducted in any other way. If Parliament had intended that it should be otherwise conducted, there would have been five Commissioners instead of four. Where there were only four Commissioners, the constitution of the Committee necessarily led to the use of the casting vote. He looked upon what was now being done as obstruction. He had stated the main point which was being urged against the Bill, and a more frivolous pretext for rehearing he could hardly conceive. The second point was the claim of immunity which he thought was hardly more worthy of attention. No doubt at one time the law was unsettled in regard to the liability for rates of docks, but that was settled by the Mersey Docks case, and also in a local case affecting Leith. The exemption of Leith from the assessment was given by reason of the debt on the docks, which in 1860 amounted to £250,000. The Government took £50,000 in settlement of that debt, and the Scottish Courts decided, and the decision was upheld by the House of Lords, that, the debt being discharged, the docks were liable to assessment. There remained the local exemption clause on which, and not on general principles, the exemption was continued. The matter afterwards came up in several ways, and ultimately a clause was inserted in the Burgh Police Act of 1892 which provided that such exemption should continue only until repealed by Provisional Order. That was an invitation by Parliament to treat each case on its own local merits. That was what had been done in the case of Leith, and but for some technical difficulties for which the Burgh of Leith was not responsible the matter would have been settled sooner. The House had heard about ports in Scotland and England which were competing with foreign ports, but there were other ports in the Firth of Forth which were competing with Leith, and which were not immune from asessment. There were Boness and Grangemouth which competed with Leith. At Kirkcaldy a harbour was being built at considerable expense. He thought these ports should be allowed to conduct their trade without Leith harbour and docks being given the undue preference they now enjoyed in being able to escape a fair share of local taxation. Leith was the cheapest port, and it already sufficiently drew trade away from the other ports. Leith docks were a most prosperous and wealthy concern. Long might they be so. They were bound to become more prosperous with the great development of the Lothian collieries alone. This great institution was valued at about £2,250,000, and its debt was only £800,000. Its net revenue, after paying interest and sinking fund, was something like £30,000 a year. The ratepayers of Leith were in an unusual degree people of small means, because the wealthier people who carried on business in the burgh mostly lived out of the burgh. The Docks Commissioners pleaded that they did the lighting and policing in their docks, but they did no more than any of the ratepayers would have to do in providing policing and lighting for their own places of business. Then in regard to the streets, the town authorities are quite ready to take them over, and they would have to do so if they were asked. When they left the streets which were maintained by the Commissioners of the Docks and came to those which were maintained by the burgh ratepayers they found that the traffic was something like 500,000 tons a year to Edinburgh. That traffic was conducted by heavy lorries which did enormous damage to the streets, and that fact constituted a good case why the Commissioners of the Docks should contribute their full quota to the rates like the other ratepayers. His surprise was that the Burgh of Leith did not insist on more than was now asked, and especially the payment of poor rates. The burgh must be astonished at its own moderation and at the consideration it had shown for the great shipowners of Scotland, England, Ireland, and elsewhere, who now enjoyed the use of Leith docks without contributing their quota to the public revenue of the burgh. Leith was asking to receive a very moderate and a very tardy measure of justice. It was supported in its contentions by Convention of Royal Burghs, and by other ports in Scotland, and he confidently asked the House to uphold the decision which had been arrived at by the Committee presided over by the hon. Baronet the Member for Inverness-shire. He asked this as a supporter of the principle of local inquiry. No case whatever had been advanced for re-hearing. The case had had a perfectly fair hearing and no fresh matter had been brought forward to justify a re-hearing.

MR. C. E. PRICE said that for many reasons he would have preferred that this matter had not been brought before the House. The Leith Docks Commissioners were known to himself; they were men of high standing, and their association with the management of the docks had been entirely to the satisfaction of those concerned. But inasmuch as a great principle was involved in the question now before the House he thought it was his duty to support the hon. Member for the Leith Burghs. The question at issue was whether any trading body should exist in any town or burgh and have separate or special treatment by way of exemption from rates. He held that no trading body, whether they made profits for themselves or others, should exist and have special and separate treatment. He wished to refer to the composition of the Committee. If hon. Members would look at the document supplied by the Leith Dock Commissioners, they would see that there were two Members of the House of Lords and two Members of the House of Commons. He could not think that that Committee was what might be termed a democratic body when they remembered that at the present time there was a great difference of opinion in the Liberal Party as to the rights of trading communities. He was sure that if that Committee had reflected the relative position of the Parties in that House it would have come to a decision which it would not have been necessary to wish to revise. The second point was that if they had four Members in a Committee he did not see how it was possible for that Committee to carry on its business without using the casting vote of the chairman. It was quite conceivable to have two on each side. With regard to the value of the casting vote of the chairman, he was quite sure no Member of that House was better qualified to preside on that Committee than the hon. Member for Inverness Burghs, if only for the simple fact that he had had an excellent business training. He was one of the most popular provosts that ever presided over Perth, and he was admirably qualified to use that casting vote. The hon. Member who seconded the referring of this matter to another Committee had questioned the value of decisions come to so far from this House. But as London happened to be a good way from Scotland, he did not see how they could hold any inquiries in Scotland without a decision being come to from a long way off.

Mr. W. R. REA said he had no intention of impugning the value of decisions come to in Edinburgh, but there were certain occasions where a decision was come to by the narrowest possible majority, and in such cases he thought it was desirable to exercise these powers which they were entitled under the Act to exercise and to revise the decisions. He had no intention of casting any reflection on the value of inquiries held in Scotland.

Mr. C. E. PRICE said that in order to meet the objection of the hon. Member the Committee should have been composed of five and not four members, but the Committee was appointed under the rules of the House, and the objection should have been taken earlier. As it was, it was scarcely possible to submit any question to any body of four members where they would have three giving their votes one way. Another point was that if they were lightly to set aside the decision of local committees and local inquiries, what value were they to derive from the Committee which it took Scotland so many years to get established at all? If they were going to set aside the decision of the Committee without some new facts being brought forward, and no new facts had been brought forward, simply because certain Members objected to that decision, that inquiry became of no benefit to Scotland. Another aspect of the question was that if they referred it to another Committee they at once increased enormously the expenses which had been associated with the inquiry, and therefore he trusted that the House would not listen to the arguments of the mover and seconder of the Motion. It seemed to him simply absurd that a trading body should have the right of carting their goods from Leith Docks through their streets up to Edinburgh and yet bear no share of the expense of the upkeep of those streets. It was not possible for them in Edinburgh to get access to Leith Burghs without covering the streets of Leith, and accordingly to exempt this Dock Commission from rating was to his mind not dealing equitably and fairly with those concerned.

Mr. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth) said it was a part of the Scottish procedure that there should be an appeal to that House, an appeal, of course, as the last speaker said, which must not be lightly exercised. He was sure that no one representing an English constituency would desire that that appeal should be lightly exercised, but there must be cases occasionally in which it was right to challenge the decision of a Private Bill Committee in Scotland, and the question before the House was really whether this was or was not such a case. This matter of the Leith Docks and the Leith Burghs, as he understood it, was a very old story; it was not a new story at all. It had been going on for about forty years. The exemptions which the Dock Commissioners of Leith were entitled to had been in operation for something like a century, and during the last forty years, according to the statement of the advocate who represented the Leith Burghs before the Committee, no less than four attempts, if not five, had already been made by approach to Parliament to get rid of those exemptions by the burgh of Leith. He had in his hands a summary of those attempts. The advocate for the Dock Commissioners stated, rightly or wrongly—he was formerly a Member of that House and held an official position there, so that he might be assumed to know what he was speaking about—that Parliament told the Leith Burghs in 1863 and in 1868 that they should not get rid of these exemptions, that in 1875 this whole matter was discussed and thrashed out before a Committee of that House, and that then these exemptions were still maintained, and that again in 1892 and in 1903 attempts were made to get rid of these exemptions by the Leith Burghs which attempts were equally unsuccessful. Therefore, what the House had to consider was that this was an old dispute that had gone on for forty years and on which Parliament had four or five times already indicated its mind in favour, not of the burgh of Leith, but of the Dock Commissioners. Therefore, on the top of all those attempts of Leith to get rid of these exemptions, they had this inquiry by a Private Bill Committee, which after an exhaustive inquiry was equally divided; so that after a prolonged dispute evidently upon a matter which, to put it no higher, Parliament was extremely doubtful about, they had the additional capital debt which could not be estimated at less than £100,000 put upon those Dock Commissioners and the Dock Estate at Leith by the casting vote of the chairman of that Committee. He was perfectly satisfied, and he felt sure every Member was satisfied, that that casting vote was given after the most careful deliberation and in the best exercise of his judgment, but his hon. friend, although a Scotsman, was not infallible, and as Dr. Johnson, who was notoriously a friend of Scotsmen, once said, a fallible being would fail somewhere, and what they had to consider was whether, in view of the history of this long dispute and its culmination in the casting vote of the chairman, there was not a fair *prima facie* case for a rehearing of the whole dispute upon its merits. He wished to address the House very briefly upon the question of policy which was involved by the threatened action of the burgh of Leith. His hon. friend the Member for Leith Burghs had referred to the case of the Mersey Docks, and he did not interrupt him with any idea of questioning the decision which he was quoting or of in any way insinuating that dock property like any other property was not liable to rating; but he did want to bring before the House what was the real position of the Mersey Dock Estate, because he thought it threw a great deal of light upon the policy which ought to be pursued by boroughs that desired to maintain their position in the teeth of the competition which all ports in this country had to-day to face. The position in Liverpool was this. The Mersey Docks and Harbour Board carried all the town sewers across the dock estate to their point of discharge in the river; they had paid the capital cost of constructing those sewers, and they maintained them. The Board also cleansed, scavenged, lighted, and watched the dock estate at their own cost. So far the case was almost parallel to that of Leith, the same obligations and the same duties were performed by the dock estate in Liverpool as were performed in Leith by the Dock Commissioners. By Section 224 of the Act of 1846—sixty years ago—the Board's estate, except warehouses, was exempt from sanitary rates, and that exemption had been recognised by subsequent Corporation Acts. The Board did not pay the sanitary rates, the money from which was used for the purposes of cleansing and lighting the city, and meeting the city's obligation for raising money for sewerage. As a return for that exemption the Board had constructed at their own cost the sewers under their own estate to carry off the town's sewage, and they cleansed, scavenged, and lighted the dock estate at their own expense. As regarded the policing, the same arrangement held in Liverpool as in Leith. The corporation or the borough lent police for the purpose of policing the dock estate, and the Dock Commissioners in both cases paid a charge for the hire of those police officers. His hon. friend had cited the case which made the dock estate on the Mersey liable for poor rates, but he wished to make it quite clear to the House that the position of the docks in

Liverpool was exactly parallel to that in Leith which this Provisional Order desired to upset. It was perfectly natural that the burgh of Leith should desire to get all the relief from rates that it could, and to equalise the burdens upon the ratepayers by calling in fresh sources of revenue. But was that a wise or far-seeing policy for a town or borough to adopt which was dependent upon a dock estate which had to meet the competition of foreign ports? In Liverpool the desirability of the freedom of the docks as far as possible from rates was recognised as a necessity although it was a burden, but they recognised in Liverpool, which he might claim to be one of the most prosperous ports of the United Kingdom, that it was desirable that the dock companies and the municipality should work hand in hand and that the rates upon the docks should be kept to the lowest possible level. One of the special circumstances which had brought this about had been the very formidable competition, not of tariffs, but of State-aided railways in connection with ports on the Continent, which give through rates with which the railways of this country, without extensive expenditure, could not possibly compete. Surely that was an argument for cutting down the expenses at our ports, not at once and directly, but by degrees, and he thought our authorities might be usefully employed in discussing—not so much in subsidising this or that particular trade or industry—whether they could not make the charges at the ports something approximating to the charges which had to be paid abroad. Although this Bill only concerned the Leith Burghs and only had a local action, he felt that there was a fair case not only on the merits of this particular Bill but on the policy of it for supporting the Amendment moved by his hon. friend the Member for Aberdeen.

Mr. GULLAND (Dumfries Burghs) said that after the somewhat Imperial outlook of the last speaker he would like to discuss this question from the local and Scottish point of view. There seemed to him no reason why this matter should be brought up again here because the question was thoroughly heard and dealt with in Edinburgh. The best counsel in Scotland, with the exception, perhaps, of a few Members of this House, were employed, although probably they did not receive such a high fee as the Parliamentary Bar would receive. But altogether the case was gone into so thoroughly that there was no new point which could be brought up. When they saw that Scotland had achieved the amount of self-government which had been conferred upon her under the Act, Scottish Members would be unwise if they countenanced any attempt to go behind the Private Bill Procedure which had been set up. If every litigant who was unsuccessful in Scotland was to appeal to the House they would reduce the whole of that procedure to a farce. If there was any reason, or any special reason for it, perhaps such a proceeding might be tolerated, but he had heard nothing stated that night which would justify it. He was a ratepayer in regard to the Leith Docks and therefore his interest was all the other way in this instance. But he did not think that it was fair that a Dock Commission should avoid paying rates, because Edinburgh trades used the streets of Leith for carrying their goods up to Edinburgh and down from Edinburgh. He thought they ought to pay rates and the only way they could be got at was by making the Dock Commission pay a certain proportion. That was an argument which was to his mind unanswerable. Then it was said that the Dock Commission had their own cleaning, lighting and watching to do, but so had every ratepayer within his own property. The position of dock companies was not therefore peculiar. The special reason, as he had understood it, why the Commission sitting in Scotland held that only half rates should be charged was that it was a recognition that the dock company did something in that way. But then it was said that the Burgh of Leith never subscribed a penny to the dock. That was quite true and they never subscribed a penny to any house or any works. He knew the Dock Commission well and he said that there was not in the United Kingdom a more enterprising body of men. The docks were in a flourishing condition, and to talk about ruin coming because of this extra charge was absurd. Somebody had talked about uniting Leith with Edinburgh. That was desirable, and everybody looked forward to these two burghs being amalgamated. The real competitive ports were the others in the Firth of Forth, and they all had to pay burgh rates. There was a feeling in Leith that the Dock Commission had got too much into the hands of the shipowners. It was right that they should accept the decision arrived at in Scotland which was fair and reasonable.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire) said it might be a convenience to the House if he stated the opinion of the Government on this matter. Might he remind the House that this was a serious question? A false decision might destroy the system of Private Bill procedure in Scotland which it had taken the House years to construct. Let him remind the House that the system of Private Bill procedure in Scotland was introduced under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act of 1899. There was great difficulty then in finding time for the transaction of Scottish business in Parliament. There had never been enough time available, and as years went on it had been found and would be found more and more difficult to find time for this special business of Parliament—the Private Bill legislation of Scotland—and it seemed then to be in the interest of Scotland and of Parliament that, subject always to the control of Parliament, provision should be made for such schemes and undertakings to be heard and examined locally in Scotland. When this scheme was brought before Parliament in the first instance, it contained provisions for the automatic rehearing of every case, but the House of Commons of that day was quick to see the danger of that proceeding. It was quicker than the Government. It was stronger than the Government and it refused an automatic rehearing in every case. Such a rehearing would have weakened the authority and the responsibility of the local commissioners appointed by the House itself. It would not have met the two great evils of the situation which then existed, and it would not have greatly saved the time of Paliament. Moreover, it would not have reduced expenditure — indeed, such a system as was then contemplated would have increased the expense of these proceedings. But while the automatic appeal to Parliament was revised, Parliament did reserve control of the procedure, and it was in accordance with Section 9 that his hon. friend had brought forward this Motion to ask for a Joint Committee of both Houses to review the decision arrived at by the local Commissioners in Scotland. That was the procedure laid down by the Act. The practice of the last seven or eight years confirmed the wisdom of Parliament in laying down the rule as it existed. The system had worked with great smoothness and success, and the number of Provisional Orders which were brought in under this machinery had worked out well. The system had been working since 1899, and in only four cases hitherto had there been any debate in Parliament. Only four instances had arisen in which a demand for a rehearing had been preferred. In two of those cases the rehearing was refused and in the two other cases the result of the rehearing was to confirm the decision of the local Commissioners. Therefore, Parliament had been extremely slow and reluctant to weaken the authority of these local Commissioners in any degree, and he thought properly so. It remained to consider whether there were any special reasons in the present case which could be urged as supporting a departure from the procedure hitherto followed. He thought a great deal too much emphasis had been laid on the fact that the decision of the Commissioners was arrived at by a casting vote. Nobody denied that, but he might remind the House that that contingency was foreseen by the House when the Act was passed. There was an express commission in Section 10 of the Act, by which the chairman of the four Commissioners was given a casting vote in addition to his deliberative vote, and the decision was not less the decision of that Commission because it was carried by the casting vote of the chairman. He did not wish to make too much of its being carried by the casting vote, because if he did, they were likely to run into a another and serious danger, which was that they might assent to the view that because a decision was arrived at by the casting vote of a chairman that decision was one that necessarily demanded a rehearing. That would be contrary to the spirit of the Act itself and might contain the germ of a precedent very dangerous to the whole procedure. In this instance there was no case as there was in the other Leith case of a locus being denied. The case was well and ably presented, and it was fully and patiently heard by the Commissioners so far as he could gather. What produced the decision of that Commission, broadly, was in the first place the possession by the Dock Company of a considerable sum of surplus income, and, secondly, the general rule of other cases. Broadly speaking, the decision brought this case into conformity with the general law. Dock companies were liable under the general law to pay rates, while, on the other hand, according to practice, they received some measure of exemption. It was no part of his duty on that occasion to go into the merits of the case, but, inasmuch as the actual parties in the matter had laid their case before him, the House no doubt would expect him to express an opinion upon it. It had not hitherto been usual for the Government to interfere with the discussion in the House on these matters, and he proposed to follow precedent in this case. But, after full examination into the matter he could find no reason to think that an injustice had been done; no new facts had arisen and there was no substantial ground, as it appeared to him, for believing that another tribunal would come to any other decision than that which had been arrived at by the present tribunal. It would be a similar tribunal to that which had already examined the case, and he saw no reason for differing from the decision of that tribunal. Speaking for himself, he could not support the Motion proposed by his hon. friend.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.) said he would like to draw attention to the fact that any arrangement that was arrived at by the Commissioners who held the inquiry in this case was not a compromise. If it had been a compromise he would certainly not have been found standing in his place in that House to support a party which, having made a compromise in Scotland, came to Westminster to endeavour to upset it. If the hon. Gentleman the Member for Leith Burghs considered the matter in the light of the volume of evidence which he held in his hand he would find that there was no compromise whatever. The question the House had to consider was whether the party dissatisfied with this decision had the right, and whether, if they had the right, it was proper that they should exercise that right to ask for a re-hearing by another Committee. The hon. Member for Dumfries Burghs seemed to think that there was some idea of going behind the local opinion in Scotland, but nothing was so far from the facts. There was no question, whatever, of going behind any local opinion or any evidence. All that was being done was to follow in this House the procedure laid down in the words of the Act which set up these local tribunals. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland had referred to the Act and had stated the most extraordinary proposition he had ever heard, namely, that when the Act was passed it was laid down by this House that no party who desired to make an appeal to the House should have the right, necessarily, to make that appeal, or have a right to ask for that appeal. He would like to refer the right hon. Gentleman to a speech made by the then Lord Advocate, the present Lord President of the Court of Sessions, who said that the House settled and embodied in the Bill a provision that any person who appeared before a local Parliamentary tribunal and was dissatisfied should have a right to go to another tribunal. The then Lord Advocate's view was that inasmuch as this House had, as a matter of considered policy, come to the conclusion and embodied that conclusion in an Act of Parliament, namely, that there should be an appeal to Parliament, that appeal ought to be given as an ordinary right, unless someone was in a position to say the case was one that ought not to be debated on appeal. Did the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland say that this was a case which ought not to be debated on appeal? He only desired to point out for the information of some hon. Members that the decision on which this re-hearing was being asked was not the decision on the whole of the case, but a decision upon one part of the case, which decision was arrived at by the casting vote of the Chairman. Even a Commission was not infallible. As the hon. Member for the East Toxteth division of Liverpool had said, even the best of them might be wrong sometimes. They had the admission of the framers of the 1899 Act, and they had the admission of those who had read that Act and who sat upon the Treasury Bench that in passing that Act Parliament desired to keep for itself the power to revise and to inquire into the findings of the various Commissions which were appointed. When was that power to be exercised? Could the House conceive any case in which it was to be exercised, unless it was a case where the decision was arrived at upon an equal division of opinion in the Commission by the casting vote of the chairman, as in this case? His mind failed to conjure up any situation that was adequate to meet that proposition if this was not the case. All he wanted to urge upon the House was, if the facts and figures were placed before the local Commission with full knowledge of the circumstances and local matters, by the most skilful advocates of the Scottish Bar, and, if as a result of that the decision was only obtained by the casting vote of the chairman, then surely if there was any right to appeal for a re-hearing, it was in a case of that kind. If a question of public policy was concerned, he would point out to the hon. Member for Leith Burghs that while he did not dispute his law he would like to point out two facts; first, that this particular Dock Authority paid rates up to 24 per cent. of its gross earnings; and secondly, that it carried on its business on land which, if the policy of the Government, adumbrated in this House only the other day, was carried out, was to be exempted altogether on the ground that it was a product of industry, it being reclaimed land. The Commissioners were a body representing the public, they made profits for the public, and it would be a serious problem were one public authority to be liable for work which another public authority was liable to keep up. In regard to the streets the fact of the matter was that 80 per cent. of the traffic of Leith was through traffic which went by railway and never passed through the streets of Leith at all. The Dock Commissioners were responsible for the upkeep of over two miles of streets, and they did keep them up. He did not think it would be disputed that in the passing of the Act of 1899 that House and Parliament desired to reserve to itself the power of revising and if need be correcting, affirming, or denying the results of local inquiries. That delegation of powers was a delegation of powers to a sub-Committee and not an entire delegation of all the powers of that House. The right of revision was reserved, it existed, and if it was ever to be exercised he could imagine no class of case in which it could be more justly and legitimately exercised.

*SIR JOHN DEWAR (Inverness) said, as chairman of the Committee which dealt with this matter, he wanted to say a word or two about it and to state the reasons why he gave his casting vote. After all, it was a very simple case, and he did not object to the way in which it had been presented to the House. But the question was simply this, whether or not—and it was a principle they all recognised—everybody within the municipal boundary was bound to contribute his fair share towards the municipal government of the town. If that principle was not given effect to efficient municipal government was impossible. Leith docks were exempted from rates as far back as 1805; and that had been going on all these years, and it seemed to him that it was only right that this arrangement should now be reconsidered. Leith docks had escaped during all these years a very large amount of taxation, while all the time they were getting the service of the Leith Burgh. The public health department, for instance, which was very largely occupied in the service of the Leith Docks. Every ship had to be examined by the medical officer and his assistants, and in many cases to be disinfected and a great many services rendered. The Leith docks paid public health rates from 1867 to 1905, and when they refused to continue to pay them the financial affairs of Leith were thrown into confusion and Leith was compelled to present this Bill. They were told that the docks policed their own premises, but so did railways and other enterprises. The Leith docks were well policed, but they received besides a great deal of assistance from the Leith police, who acted along with the dock police. Not only that, but all offenders arrested by the dock police were brought before the borough police court, where the person was charged and all the machinery of the burgh police force used in bringing him to justice. It was on the general principle that every one ought to contribute to the government of the municipality that he gave his casting vote. Certain concessions had been made and half rates were agreed to for certain services. He had been a little doubtful whether any concession should be made, and it was only because a compromise had been come to between the burgh authorities and the Dock Commissioners that he agreed. The Leith burgh officials agreed that there ought to be some allowance given in regard to the services rendered by the Leith Dock Commissioners in policing and other matters, and the agreement was that one-half of the rate should be accepted in respect of certain charges. The burgh authorities agreed that it was a reasonable proposal that one-half of the rate should be accepted. Since the burgh was satisfied he consented, but he had grave doubts as to whether any concession should be made at all. He knew that in Glasgow an allowance of 4d. in the £ was made in similar circumstances in respect of the docks. He did not think that any great injustice had been done. As a general principle he held that everybody ought to contribute a fair share to the government of the municipality. If Leith docks were to remain exempt it meant that every ratepayer in the town had to pay 1½d. in the £, working men of Leith contributing 1s. 6d. or 2s. each, so that a rich corporation might get off its just contribution. That was why he gave his casting vote. He had given a great many casting votes in his time and he had often given them in favour of the *status quo ante;* but what would have happened if his casting vote had been given on that side on this occasion. Leith had tried for thirty years to have this injustice removed; for various reasons they had been unsuccessful, but after presenting their case to a Commission which sat for four days, they had in his judgment completely established their case, and if his casting vote had been given in favour of the *status quo ante* it meant that Leith had no further means of being heard. They were here dealing with a corporation which was making a surplus of £30,000, and he did not think that it was one of the institutions which ought to be relieved. He thought the House itself ought to decide the principle as to whether or not the docks ought to be relieved from contribution to the rates. The practice of exemption from rates he believed to be a wrong method of giving assistance from a municipality. If contribution was to be made it should be made in such a way that every one might know what it was.

*MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) said he was one of those concerned in the proceedings in connection with the Scottish Private Bill Procedure Act, and he wished to say a word or two with regard to what the Secretary for Scotland had said. If anyone was entitled to respect in the giving of a casting vote it was the hon. Member who had just sat down. Still, it was evident from what he had told them that he had strong views on the general question, and the very fact of his having those strong views was an example of the fact that this question ought to be dealt with by Parliament and not by a local tribunal. Another fallacy which ran all through the considerations and decision of the hon. Gentleman was that he treated the dock company as if it were an individual or a trading corporation. But it was not possible to predicate of this Dock Commission that it was a corporation either rich or poor; everything it did was in the public service. It was entirely beside the mark to make comparisons between this corporation and the poorest inhabitants of Leith, or such comparisons as were usually made between rich and poor.

*SIR J. DEWAR: The decision given in the Mersey Dock case held that such corporations are liable for rates.

*MR. STUART WORTLEY said that this was a case in which the corporation had special exemption because of the value which was given by that corporation;

and here they were proposing to diminish the security to lenders of money without at the same time assuming any responsibility for the debt due to them. These were facts which caused the greatest doubt about the decision arrived at, and one asked one's self in what case, if not in this, should there be the rehearing which it was contemplated by the Procedure Act that there should be in these cases? The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland had said that there was originally a provision in the Bill to hear all cases. He had not been able, in the discussions which had taken place, to find it. There was, however, a question twice raised by the right hon. Gentleman the present Lord Advocate; twice he moved in the Committee stage on the Procedure Bill, and on Report, to omit these retrials in opposed cases before a joint Committee of the two Houses, but the House twice decided to retain them in the Bill. It might be said that the instances were rare in which the House had consented to any such procedure. But it was also true that the instances were rare in which they had the casting vote of the Chairman. After all it was a matter of ordinary experience and of common sense. Here they had a Committee equally divided on a question of the first magnitude in the Bill, and in what case should the House itself be resorted to for a decision if not in such a case as this? What were the facts which had induced this Committee to reverse all the decisions of previous Parliamentary Committees? He was glad to hear that the right hon. Gentleman did not propose to exert the Government influence or to interfere in any way with the decision of the House, and he thought that the House would do well to adopt the Motion of the hon. Gentleman the Member for West Aberdeenshire, on the ground that it was exactly the sort of case in which it was intended by the House and by Parliament that a rehearing should take place.

MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire) said he was also a Member of the Committee which had been referred to, and he remembered that when the question of these appeals was before Parliament the House was most careful about retaining in its hands the decision in the circumstances which had been alluded to. Some hon. Members seem to think that every time the chairman used his casting vote there should be an appeal to Parliament. That was not the intention of the House of Commons when the Scottish procedure for Private Bills was adopted. If it had been the House of Commons would never have inserted the provision for the chairman to use his casting vote. It had been asked under what circumstances could there be an appeal. There were two contemplated in the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act of 1899. One case was when any new facts arose which had not been before the Committee, and the other was one in which there had been some flagrant act of injustice. In the case of this Bill no new issue had cropped up and no flagrant injustice had been done to anybody. In his opinion the Committee which sat in Leith for five days was much more competent to come to a decision on the merits of the Bill than a joint Committee of Lords and Commons.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College) said that, notwithstanding the warning given by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland, he desired to support the Motion that this Bill should be referred to a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons. Immunity from taxation had been enjoyed from time immemorial by these docks, and they had never been taxed for burgh purposes. The arrangement which had existed for so long was placed in the form of a contract in 1838 by an Act passed in this House, and there was a *quid pro quo* given on the part of the Dock Commissioners of Leith. By that arrangement the Commissioners had to bear several burdens, and it was on account of that fact that they were permitted to be immune from taxation, an arrangement which had existed up to the time when it was proposed to alter it under this Bill. One of the burdens they bore was £8,000 a year, which was utilised practically for the upkeep of Edinburgh University and the schools in Edinburgh. These liabilities were still borne by the Dock Commissioners, and it was for this reason that the Commissioners had not, up till now, been taxed by the Burgh Commissioners of Leith. Another burden which the Dock Commissioners undertook in 1838 was the lighting, policing, and scavenging of the dock estate. That cost them £10,000 a year, and that was one of the burdens which they took over. The third burden they took over was the upkeep of the streets outside the dock estate. These arrangements had upon four separate occasions been assailed in Parliament with the object of empowering the Town Council of Leith to tax the Dock Commissioners, and on each of those four occasions they had failed. Parliament in three Public Acts had recognised and continued the exemption from rating on account of the burdens which the Dock Commissioners were bearing. One Commission which sat in Edinburgh unanimously came to the conclusion that the Dock Commissioners should be taxed with the public health rate, and that burden amounted to about £1,700 a year; but even that Commission recommended that the Dock Commissioners should not be charged for arrears in this respect, and consequently there was a spirit of compromise even in that decision. The effect of the casting vote of the chairman would be that the Dock Commissioners would be saddled with an additional £3,000 a year in spite of the definite arrangement made in 1838, under which they got immunity from these taxes. He thought for these and other reasons, the Bill ought to be referred to a Select Committee of both Houses of Parliament.

MR. RAINY (Kilmarnock Burghs) said that the matter was one of considerable importance from the point of view of procedure. When a Commission appointed under the Act came to a decision after very careful investigation there should be no interference with it unless some manifest injustice had been done, or unless there had been some omission of material facts, or some new facts had come to light. Unless they were going to make a farce of Scottish private legislation procedure, the House was bound to support the decision of the Committee. No evidence had so far been produced in the debate to show that any injustice had been done. [Cries of "Oh, oh!"] He knew there was a difference of opinion upon some points, but he did not think it had been shown that there had been any manifest injustice, or that there had been any omission of considerations which ought to have been before the Commission, and no new facts had been adduced which the Commission had not before them. If the House of Commons gave countenance to some of the *dicta* which had been laid down in this debate they would make a perfect farce of the whole of Scotch private legislation procedure. Therefore, he asked the House to consider very carefully before it upset the decision which was come to. He admitted that there was a very fine point about the chairman's casting vote, but he also submitted to the House that sufficient materials had not been presented that night to make it appear that this was a matter where the House should upset the decision of the Committee.

*MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland) said his hon. friend had in support of his argument quoted a late Lord Advocate. But as far back as 1901, when one of the first cases decided by a Scottish Committee came before this House, Mr. Graham Murray, now Lord Dunedin, was emphatic in upholding the right of this House to review the decision of the Committee. In this case he took the view that the House might well, and without casting any slur on the Committee who sat in Edinburgh, review the decision. If the decision of the House was favourable to the Committee it would do very much to strengthen the hands of these Committees in future. If the decision was unfavourable, then, at any rate, the Commissioners of the Harbour of Leith would feel that they had had their case fairly presented to the House of Commons. They were only asking a re-hearing. An appeal was now granted in almost every case. He would not repeat arguments which had already been laid before the House, but would support the Motion of his hon. friend the Member for Aberdeen.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 80; Noes, 236. (Division List No. 285.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingham
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cory, Clifford John
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gretton, John
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edmd's
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lupton, Arnold
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Partington, Oswald
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Renton, Major Leslie
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Seely, Major J. B.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wilkie, Alexander
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, Hon. C. H. W. (Hull, W.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. John Henderson and Mr Russell Rea.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Black, Arthur W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh.
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh S.)
Dewar Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J
Hardy, George A (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R L (Caithness-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.

Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Hudson, Walter
Hunt, Rowland
Hyde, Clarendon
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J M. (Falkirk Burghs
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, E. S.
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncaster
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Richards, T. F. (Wolverhampt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hn. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Thornton, Percy M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampton
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York., E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York., W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Munro Ferguson and Mr. Charles Price.

Bill to be considered To-morrow.

FINANCE BILL.

Postponed Proceeding on Amendment proposed, on consideration of the Bill, as amended, resumed.

Which Amendment was—

"In page 9, line 24, at the end to insert the words, '(d) any annuity which has been purchased out of savings from income derived from the exercise of any trade, profession, or vocation.'"—(*Mr. Fell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

MR. HICKS BEACH said he would be inclined to think that incomes derived from annuities were much more worthy of consideration than those derived from pensions, because, as had already been pointed out, an income derived from pensions was really due to very little self-sacrifice on the part of the pensioner. A man accepted a situation under the Civil Service, or a railway, or an individual, or in the Army or Navy, at a certain salary, and with the full knowledge that when he retired from that service he would receive a definite pension. What was the case of a man who put aside a certain sum out of his annual income and saved sufficient money to buy himself an annuity? That demanded considerable self-sacrifice and determination on the part of a man, and he believed that such a man was far more worthy of consideration than the man who derived his income from a pension. The conclusion he had drawn from the debates on this subject of the differentiation between earned and unearned incomes was that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not paid sufficient consideration to the evidence of Sir Henry Primrose given before the Income-tax Committee. He pointed out that evidence had been laid before the Committee, which showed that although the income-tax itself did not provide for differentiation between different kinds of income, the general scheme of our taxation did do so by means of other taxes, viz., house duty, stamps, and most of all, death duties. He had handed into the Committee a Paper in which an attempt was made to show in terms of an annual tax the burden that the death duties imposed on those who enjoyed incomes that had the character of being unearned or permanent. He pointed out that a man with an income of between £40 and £400 a year really paid 9d. in the £, which a man with an earned income did not pay; that a man with an income between £400 and £1,000 a year paid an income-tax of 1s., and between £1,000 and £2,000 a year an income-tax of 1s. 1½d., quite apart from the ordinary income-tax. Sir Henry went on to say that the effect of a variation of the income-tax would not be quite the same thing as an increase on the death duties, for it would impose a special tax on savings while still in the hands of the person who made the savings, whereas the death duties deferred any special taxation (other than such as arose under the stamp duties) until the savings passed to someone other than the saver. It would surely be very inconsistent if the State, after encouraging saving by means of the Post Office and other savings banks, were to penalise the income derived from such savings. That was an important piece of evidence to which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made no allusion at all, and he submitted that in resisting the Amendment of his hon. friend below him the right hon. Gentleman was directly imposing a premium on thriftlessness. It was no encouragement to a man who had saved sufficient to provide himself with an annuity if, when he had bought that annuity, it were treated not as a pension, but as an unearned income, and he believed the whole tendency of this differentiation between earned and unearned incomes would be to discourage a person to make any savings at all in his lifetime and to induce him to spend the whole of his income as rapidly as he could. For that reason he most cordially supported the hon. Gentleman.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 65; Noes, 260. (Division List, No. 286.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn Sir Alex. F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G(Winchester
Barrie, H.T.(Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J.A. (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robt. (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W.V. (Hants, W.)
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gretton, John
Gurdon, Rt Hn Sir W. Brampton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A.R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York., E.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Fell and Mr. Harmood-Banner.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Gulland, John W.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Harmsworth, R. L (Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N. E.)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mond, A.
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T. F. (Wolverhampt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Dav
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.

Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Bell
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley,Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E.
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Ward,W.Dudley (Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson,Hon. C.H.W. (Hull, W
Wilson,Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Amendments proposed and agreed to without discussion :—

"In page 10, line 9, to leave out the word 'provision,' and to insert the word 'section.'"

"In page 11, line 21, after the word 'made,' to insert the words 'and allowed or signed.'"

"In page 11, line 37, to leave out the words 'be repealed,' and to insert the words 'cease to have effect as respects income-tax charged for the year beginning the sixth day of April, nineteen hundred and seven, or for any subsequent year.'"—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

SIR F. BANBURY moved the omission of Subsection (1) of Clause 25. He said he did so because the Chancellor of the Exchequer had evidently been unable to find words embodying the concession which they had understood he desired to make. The right hon. Gentleman promised to meet the case of the man who had a dwindling business, and what he had done was to meet the entirely different case of the man who had decided to discontinue his business because of failure. Unless the subsection of the old Act was allowed to remain in operation the man with a dwindling business would be compelled under the system of three years' average to pay income-tax on income he had not earned. He begged to move the omission of Subsection (1).

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER, in seconding the Amendment, was understood to say that it could not be denied that so far as regarded losses made during three or four years the trader was never recouped in making his return. If he made profits in the succeeding years after those in which he had sustained the losses, he was never recouped, because he could not bring all those years of losses into account. It was not simply a question of taking up a calculation of averages and saying that by deleting the clause they were placing it on a fair basis, because a man who had sustained losses in his business for a succession of years was unable to recoup himself in the prosperous years when he made profits. He could assure the House it was by no means uncommon in the shipping trade to make losses for two, three, and four years together. And the experience in the coal-mining industry was similar. If they made their big shilling one year they made their little halfpenny or penny another, or made losses. Losses on collieries were frequent, and continued sometimes for three years or more together, and those losses could not be recouped in the time of the big shilling. They could only bring in two of the years in calculating the average. That was one of the reasons why this particular clause had been given to the public. He quite understood that the clause gave a great amount of trouble in making assessments that had immediately to be revised and the whole trouble to be gone over again. It was the same thing as regarded capital and expenditure. No doubt the Chancellor of the Exchequer was familiar with the Minutes of the evidence taken before the Income Tax Committee. Sir Henry Primrose, in answer to a question, put it very clearly that this clause was given to the coal-owners as compensation for the fact that they were not allowed to take into account capital expenditure on shafts and other works connected with the mines. If they drove a horizontal tunnel it was charged to revenue; but if they sunk a shaft it was charged to capital, and was not allowed for in the return for income-tax. There were other years which showed that coal owners were very hardly dealt with in regard to this question of income and profits, and it was for that reason that this clause was given to mine owners and ship owners and thousands of others in the community. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was taking away that benefit, though it was perfectly true—and he and others were grateful to him for it—that in this Finance Bill these questions were being dealt with on a broader and wider basis than they had ever been dealt with before. Still, the right hon. Gentleman was taking away the benefit of this clause, and was giving them no boon by way of compensation. This subsection ought to be withdrawn until the right hon. Gentleman had brought in the clauses he had promised. The process of taking the average might be a proper one, but to take away the benefit and not give compensation was neither fair nor reasonable.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 11, line 38, to leave out Subsection (2) of Clause 25."—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. ASQUITH said the proposal was the unanimous recommendation of a departmental Committee of acknowledged authority upon which sat Lord Ritchie and Sir Henry Primrose. The Postmaster-General pointed out the other night that the present system caused injustice between taxpayers and operated unfairly as between the taxpayer and the State. Under the present law the taxpayer could claim the benefit of a bad year, but the State could not claim the extra benefit of a good year. Taking the three years average, if in the first two a man made a loss and in the third did pretty well, he would pay income-tax on the average. What could be fairer? The three years average must work out reasonably in the long run. That was the ground on which the powerful Ritchie Committee made their recommendation. He agreed, however, that where a business was practically moribund it ought to be possible to make some revision to meet the exigencies of the case. That, however, did not affect the general question.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he agreed with the report of the Committee to which the right hon. Gentleman had alluded and also with the argument put forward by the Postmaster-General on a former occasion. The Chancellor of the Exchequer made an important statement the other night when he said that, when a man had an actual loss in any one year, it would enter into his average, not merely as a *nil*, but as a *minus* quantity. To many traders that fact was of great importance, and he hoped the discussion of the point would make it more widely known that where they made an actual loss they were entitled to treat it that year as a *minus* quantity for the purpose of their average and not merely as *nil.* As far as he was concerned, he thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer had met his objection by the Amendment he had put on the Paper. He thought the right hon. Gentleman had gone as far as it was possible for him to go, and, so far as he was concerned, he had only to express his thanks to the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. SAMUEL ROBERTS (Sheffield, Ecclesall) said that some of those who took part in the former debate were disappointed at what the Chancellor of the Exchequer now proposed. They anticipated that the right hon. Gentleman would have met the case of the man with a dwindling business which he had admitted was a case that ought to be met. This section had been in operation since 1842, and he understood that it was imported into the statute of that year from the original Act of 1806. Therefore, the Chancellor of the Exchequer was acting on a section which had been in operation for 100 years. Traders were entitled to repayment, but they could not get repayment without taking professional advice, and that that was an expensive process. He thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer might have accepted the Amendment, for he felt certain that under the present system the exchequer received money every year in respect of income which had not been earned.

Mr. COURTHOPE said that, in spite of what the right hon. Gentleman had said, it could be easily proved that under the present system of averaging many traders paid more for income-tax than they ought to pay.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 251; Noes, 54. (Division List No. 287.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt)
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Brights, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chance, Frederick William
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William

Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery C.)
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt. Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh.
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N. E.)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain

King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mond, A.
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Einb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T. F. (Wolverhampton
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)

Robinson, S.
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E.
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gretton, John
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Frederick Banbury and Mr. Harmood-Banner.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 12, line 11, at end, to insert the words '(3) Where a profession, trade, or vocation is discontinued in any year, any person charged or chargeable with income-tax in respect of that profession, trade, or vocation shall be entitled to be charged on the actual amount of the profits or gains arising from the profession, trade, or vocation in that year, and shall also, if he proves to the satisfaction of the Commissioners, by whom the assessment has been or could have been made, that the total amount of the income-tax paid during the three previous years in respect of that profession, trade, or vocation exceeds the total amount which would have been paid if he had been assessed in each of those years on the actual amount of the profits or gains arising in respect of the profession, trade, or vocation, be entitled to repayment of the excess.'"—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) said he presumed the intention of the Amendment was that the person who discontinued a trade should not be charged on more than his actual earnings during the year in which he discontinued that trade and the two previous years, and if that was the case he would respectfully suggest to the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the clause was worded wrongly, because it brought in not merely the year in which the trade was discontinued but the three previous years. He therefore suggested that it should read "during the year in question and the two previous years."

MR. COURTHOPE moved to add after the word "discontinued" the words "or the income derived from them is diminished." He said he did not depend upon those words to meet the case completely, but he maintained that the proposed clause did not entirely carry out the undertaking which the right hon. Gentleman gave in Committee. It dealt with the case of a defunct industry, but the Chancellor of the Exchequer promised to deal also with the case of a dwindling industry. They all knew that an industry might continue to dwindle during far more than two or three years, but this clause would only meet the case of the last few years of that process, and it was in the hope of abstracting some further concession from the right hon. Gentleman that he moved the addition of the words he had mentioned.

*MR. MORTON (Sutherland) said he desired to second the Motion, which was not a political but a business matter. He quite agreed that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had carried out his promises to a large extent and had endeavoured to meet the points which were raised in Committee, but it was not quite clear as to what would be done with diminished incomes. It might be that an income was discontinued altogether, as the clause apparently read, but it might not be discontinued altogether; it might be greatly diminished. He had no doubt the Chancellor of the Exchequer was anxious to do what was right and fair in the matter, and that traders should pay only on the actual income they made, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not object to adopting the words proposed, or similar words, so as to make the matter quite clear to traders. It was a difficult and complicated matter to deal with this question of the average income, but he hoped, if the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not adopt the words proposed, that he would endeavour to meet them so that it might be clearly understood that a diminished income as well as a discontinued income would be dealt with in the clause.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment to the Bill—

"In line 1, after the word 'discontinued,' to insert the words 'or the income derived therefrom is diminished.'—(*Mr. Courthope.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed Amendment to the Bill."

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON explained that on three whole years a person would be able to obtain the excess of income-tax he had paid if in those years, and only if in those years, the profit in an individual year had been less than the average of those years. The Amendment moved by the hon. Member for Rye went far beyond any pledge given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Government could not accept it. Of course what they wanted to deal with was this question of dwindling incomes, but it was now proposed to get rid of the average system of ascertaining the profits made from year to year. The average system was a benefit to those who paid under Schedule B. as they were in a much better position than income-tax payers under other schedules. The object of the average system was that men should pay on their actual profits. It was thought that it would be more convenient on the whole that, instead of paying on the profit from year to year, they should pay on an average of three years. That involved that, while in the good year the income-taxpayer would pay less, in the bad year necessarily he would have to pay more in the way of income-tax than that which would be due on the profit he had made in that year. Now the hon. Gentleman was proposing that where the profits were falling the income-taxpayer should be able to pay, not on the three years average but on the income of the year. The only way out of that was to make him pay on a particular year. Having examined into the question while on a Departmental Committee he was not enamoured of the three years system, but traders preferred that system and they could not have it without its disadvantages. He could not understand how they could propose to have the benefit of one particular year in which their profits were dwindling and not suffer in other years. They would of course be unable in any one year to substitute the bad year's profit for the good year's profit on the three years average. It was suggested, however, that the taxpayer should be able in bad years to substitute the income of the year for the three years average. That would so destroy the average system that they could not accept the Amendment. Under the proposal of his right hon. friend no harm would be done, whereas the suggestion of the hon. Gentleman would do a great deal of harm to people engaged in trade.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS thought there had been a little misunderstanding. They thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer had promised more than had been given. They understood that he was going to deal with the case of a dwindling business.

MR. ASQUITH said he had never done anything more than promise to try to do his best to meet a case of hardship. He had promised nothing.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS said the right hon. Gentleman had not met the case of a dwindling business, but only that of a business which had ceased altogether. He would suggest that he should leave it to the Commissioners to find whether any injustice had been done.

*MR. ASQUITH said he was sorry he could not accept the hon. Member's suggestion. He was afraid there had been a misunderstanding, because he knew the extreme limits of the case with which he was dealing. He was afraid he should not be able to give any relief at all, but these words would give substantial relief. What he understood by a dwindling business was one which was steadily going down hill. This subsection which he proposed—though of course he should not press it, if it was not desired—would meet the case of dwindling businesses. The cases which hon. Members had in mind were already provided for. They had an average system which enabled traders to take into account three years profits, and then they had a special provision where there had been a specific cause for falling profits. He thought he had done as fairly as he could, and he asked the House to pass this clause on his assurance that if after a year's working it was capable of amendment it should be reconsidered.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN joined in the appeal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had he thought done all he could to meet the grievance. Perhaps some of them had led to a mistake by using the words "a dwindling business" too loosely. He thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer had met them as fairly as he could.

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Proposed words there inserted in the Bill.

The following Amendments were also agreed to:—

"In page 13, line 12, after the word 'the,' to insert the word 'expression.'"

"In page 13, line 25, to leave out from the beginning to the word 'clergyman,' in line 26, and to insert the words 'Where a.'"

"In page 13, lines 26 and 27, to leave out the words 'religion who shall,' and to insert the words 'any religious denomination pays.'"

"In page 13, line 27, after the word 'rent,' to insert the word 'for.'"

"In page 13, line 27, to leave out from the word 'dwelling-house,' to the word 'mainly,' in line 28, and to insert 'and uses any part thereof.'"

"In page 13, line 28, to leave out from the word 'of,' to the end, and to insert the words 'his duty or function as such clergyman or minister, such part of the rent of the dwelling-house, not exceeding one-eighth, as the Commissioners by whom any assessment for income-tax is made may allow, shall be treated for the purposes of section fifty-two of The Income Tax Act, 1853, as expenses to which the provisions of that section as to deduction and repayment apply.'"—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Bill to be read a third time upon Monday next.

LEEDS (SOUTH PARADE CHAPEL) CHARITY BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

KINGSWOOD (WHITFIELD TABERNACLE, SCHOOLROOM, ETC.) CHARITY BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

PETTY SESSIONS CLERKS (IRELAND) BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered, read the third time, and passed.

And, it being after half-past Eleven of the clock, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at nine minutes before Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, 17th July, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with:—London County Council (General Powers) Bill.

The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill. Examiner's Certificate of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Tuesday next.

Central London Railway Bill. Reported, without Amendment.

Penrith Urban District Council Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

Killery's Divorce Bill [H.L.]. Minutes of evidence and proceedings before this House on the Second Reading, together with the documents deposited in the case, returned from the Commons.

Barry Railway Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, that the Lord Oriel (*V. Massereene*) be proposed to the House as a Member of the Select Committee on the said Bill in the place of the Lord Lyveden; read, agreed to.

Leeds (South Parade Chapel) Charity Bill (No. 116); Kingswood (Whitfield Tabernacle Schoolroom, etc.) Charity Bill (No. 117); Married Women's Property Bill (No. 118). Brought from the Commons. Read 1ª, and to be printed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 3) BILL.

Moved, That the Order made on the 20th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 18th day of June next," be dispensed with.—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (The Earl of ONSLOW): My Lords, I did not raise any objections to the Motion to suspend this Standing Order, as I understand it is necessitated owing to a clerk at the Irish Office having been ill and unable to attend to business; but I protest against Bills coming up for Second Reading at this late period of the session, and I hope that next year the Irish Office will let us have their Bills at an earlier date.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to Order). The Amendments proposed by the Committees made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received to-morrow.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOILER EXPLOSIONS.

Report to the Secretary of the Board of Trade upon the working of the Boiler Explosions Acts, 1882 and 1890, with appendices. (In continuation of Parliamentary Paper [Cd. 3137]).

NAVY.

Returns of the number of courts-martial held, and summary punishments inflicted on seamen of the Royal Navy, etc., during the year 1906. Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NAVY (PAY).

List of exceptions to the King's Regulations as to pay, non-effective pay, and allowances sanctioned by the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, with the approval of the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury during the year 1906–1907. Laid before the House (pursuant to Order in Council, dated 19th December, 1881), and ordered to lie on the Table.

PETTY SESSIONS CLERKS (IRELAND) BILL (No. 119).

Brought from the Commons and read 1ª, and to be printed.

THE TERRITORIAL ARMY.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: My Lords, I rise to ask the Under-Secretary of State for War, with reference to the six days annual musketry training proposed for the Infantry Militia, in pursuance of the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—(1) What pay officers, non-commissioned officers, and men will receive during the six days; (2) Will officers, non-commissioned officers, and men receive travelling allowances when travelling between their homes and the range; (3) Whether musketry training will at all times be carried out under the superintendence of an officer; (4) Whether similar penalties will be enforced for non-attendance at musketry as are enforced for non-attendance at annual trainings; (5) Whether officers, non-commissioned officers, and men failing to attend for musketry will be retained on the strength of their battalion. I do not think I need trouble your Lordships with any remarks in putting these Questions, which explain themselves. They are an amplification of certain Questions which I placed on the Paper some days ago, and which I postponed at the request of the noble Earl the Under-Secretary. I have thought it right to put them down to-day, as the Report stage of the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill comes on to-morrow, and I hope I shall not be thought unreasonable in pressing for Answers now.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of PORTSMOUTH): My Lords, I can assure my noble friend that I have no complaint to make with regard to the course he has taken, and I thank him for his courtesy in postponing the Questions. As regards the first Question, when the Infantry Militia become the Special Contingent the pay during the six days will be at Army rates, and officers will receive, in addition, the Militia mess allowance of 4s. a day. The Answer to the second Question is in the affirmative. Officers, non-commissioned officers, and men will receive travelling expenses in such cases. As to the third Question, musketry training will be carried out under the superintendence of an officer except in exceptional circumstances, where for some reason or other an officer is not available. There may be such cases, but we do not think they will be frequent. With regard to the fourth Question, men will be liable to penalties, but whether they will be precisely similar has not yet been decided. The general conditions of annual training are not exactly the same as those attaching to the proposed musketry training, and as the enforcement of penalties will usually rest with the commanding officer, I hope your Lordships will understand that certain discretionary power must be allowed him to deal with each case on its merits. As to the fifth Question, such men will be retained on the strength of their battalion, otherwise if a man wished to get his discharge before the completion of his engagement he would only have to absent himself from musketry.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, I am a little puzzled at the last Answer of the noble Earl. I presume that a man not attending musketry will be treated like a man failing to appear at the place of parade on any other occasion. He will, I presume, be subject to military law and brought before the commanding officer and duly punished. The Answer which the noble Earl has given seems to open up a vista of want of military discipline which would be deplorable. I would like to ask whether we are to understand that it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to disunite as a general rule the musketry and the annual training? The noble Earl spoke as if musketry training was to be looked upon as something wholly distinct from annual training. That may be so in exceptional cases, but I trust that in general cases musketry training will form part of the annual training just as it does in the cases of the Militia at the present moment.

EARL BATHURST: Arising out of the noble Earl's Answer to Lord Donoughmore's first Question, may I ask whether the six days include Sunday? If so, the number of days on which the men can shoot may be reduced to a ridiculously small number. One day will be taken up by the men assembling at camp, and if Sunday intervenes there would be only four days left. Up to this year the Militia have always had three days preliminary musketry drill before they fired a shot. This year it has been increased to six days, and in the course of the training it took rather over three weeks before the shooting was concluded. According to this scheme, however, we may have only four days in all for shooting. It is obviously impossible for musketry to be improved in that short time.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: To a certain extent I appreciate the point which the noble Earl has just raised, but I think it would be better if he would put the Question on the Paper. I could then give him the exact information.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Can the noble Earl throw any light on the point as to whether the annual and the musketry training are always to be treated as separate matters?

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: I did not lay it down as a general rule, but there may be exceptions.

*LORD LOVAT: My Lords, I rise to ask His Majesty's Government—(1) What is to be the establishment of the Territorial Army; (2) What will be the total strength of the Territorial Army available as a mobile force for Home defence after the troops allocated to permanent garrisons and coast defence areas have been deducted; (3) What powers will exist under the Territorial, etc., Forces Act for the enforcement of the Ballot Act; and to move for Papers regarding the strength, composition, and training of the mobile force for Home defence. These are very simple Questions which I hope the noble Earl will do me the honour of answering. I wish to arrive at the exact number of men who will be available for a mobile Army for Home defence. This is not an altogether unimportant subject, as the whole question of the defence of the Empire depends upon it. It would appear obvious unless we have an adequate Army for Home defence it is doubtful whether the Expeditionary Force would ever start for service abroad. I need hardly quote the historical analogy of 1803 when with 718,000 men under arms in Britain we were unable to reinforce the Indian Army by a battalion in a time of crisis. Now, my Lords, His Majesty's Government have defined very clearly the exact number of the Expeditionary Force, but the actual number of men for Home defence has not been stated. At the end of last year the Secretary of State for War talked about a "nation in arms," and he afterwards spoke of 900,000 men. As far as we can make out, the number has now been boiled down to 313,000 in all for Home defence. The art of a War Minister is not entirely different from that of the gentleman on the racecourse who juggles with two hats and three guinea-pigs. If you ask the prestigiator how many guinea-pigs he has under one hat he will show you three, and if you ask how many remain under the other he will show you a not less number. If you say to him, "If I take one of your guinea-pigs away can you still produce three out of each hat?" he will probably reply in the negative; but if you ask a War Minister whether, if he takes away nine battalions from the Regular Army, twenty-three battalions from the Militia, and sixty-eight battalions from the Volunteers, he can still produce as many men for Home service and abroad, he would probably reply, "Yes, certainly, many more than my predecessor, also they will be more efficient." Being conscious that there have been reductions, and that there are to be more in the future, and knowing, moreover, that the Government assure us that we are to have more men for service abroad, I should like to ask the noble Earl to give us information as to the exact number we are going to have for Home defence. We have at present for Home defence an establishment of 470,000 men, and a strength of 336,000 men, the strength being about three-fourths of the establishment. If 313,000 men are enlisted under the new Act, and we allow for three-fourths of them, we shall have 230,000 or 240,000 men in all. It is contended by the Government that the proportion of strength to establishment will be larger under the new Act than it is at present. But it is absolutely impossible for many reasons to keep a Volunteer Army up to war strength, owing to sickness, inefficients, emigration, change of residence, lack of control. If it is admitted that we shall have only three-fourths of this reduced number, or about 240,000 men, for the defence of the country, is that enough? The strong places, which must be held, would claim up from 150,000 to 200,000 men. An authority in *The Times* stated the number at 170,000. Taking that figure, and deducting it, that will leave a mobile Army for Home defence of 60,000 or 70,000 men. That is not enough. These being the circumstances, I question very much whether this is the right time for withdrawing the whole of the powers which now exist for the enforcement of the Ballot Act. I hope we shall have Papers regarding the strength, composition, and training of the mobile force for Home defence. The Home defence force as at present existing—the Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers—are absolutely unable to move in the country, there is as yet no definite undertaking that the Territorial Army will be mobile, and I therefore hope His Majesty's Government will be able to give us information as to the main steps they intend taking to render even the small force of 60,000 or 70,000 capable of moving about and fulfilling their functions.

Moved, "That an humble address be presented to His Majesty for Papers regarding the strength, composition, and training of the mobile force for Home defence."—(*Lord Lovat.*)

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: My Lords, I am afraid my Answers will not be considered altogether satisfactory. My noble friend has made an interesting speech, in the course of which he alluded to a good many questions that are not on the Paper. I would point out that the expression "mobile force" is itself a very controversial phrase. As to the Ballot Act, that Act, in my opinion, is of very little value now, whether the Territorial Forces Bill passes or not. In answer to the first Question, the exact establishments of the various arms has not yet been fixed, but they will be considered immediately by a Committee which has already been appointed, and of which the Secretary of State is to be the Chairman. As to the second Question, I am afraid it is impossible for me to give the information desired. The military advisers of the War Office are strongly of opinion that it would be contrary to the public interest to publish it. I can assure the noble Lord, however, that this important matter has not been lost sight of, and a Return has been prepared, in accordance with a draft scheme, which is to be most carefully examined and referred to a Committee of experts. For the reason I have given I am unable to lay on the Table the Papers asked for.

*LORD LOVAT: Is the total number of the Territorial Force to be 900,000 or 300,000?

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: I am not in a position to give the figures, and I think, after the noble Lord's extremely amusing allusion to juggling with figures, I had better be very careful that the figures I do give are absolutely accurate As to the last Question, no powers will exist, under the Territorial and Reserve Forces Act for the enforcement of the Ballot Act.

LORD NEWTON: Cannot the noble Earl state approximately which is the more correct figure—900,000 or 300,000; I was almost going to say, can he tell us to half a million or so? As for its being contrary to the interests of State to publish these figures, did anyone ever hear such rubbish? This is always the reason given by Ministers when they want to prevent unpleasant truths coming to light. Does anyone in his senses believe that it will not be possible for any person who can read and write, a year hence, to know how many men we can rely upon? If we are to take the opinion of my noble friend Lord Lovat as that of an expert we have arrived at this fact, that the "nation in arms" is boiled down to practically 60,000 or 70,000 men; and the noble Lord opposite absolutely refuses to throw any further light on the question. I hope before we adjourn this afternoon some additional light will be thrown on this obscure point by some noble Lord on the Ministerial Bench.

No Minister rising to reply,

*LORD LOVAT said: I think your Lordships will agree that the Questions I have asked are very reasonable ones. We have already spent a considerable time in debating the Army Bill, but we are still uncertain as to how many men His Majesty's Government wishes to provide. I really think we ought to have this information.

LORD NEWTON: Might I venture to make an appeal to the noble Viscount on the cross benches, Lord Esher, to enlighten us?

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: The appeal of my noble friend behind me (Lord Lovat) does not appear to meet with success this evening, but I hope that, if not to-night, at any rate upon some future occasion, he and those who act with him will press for more information than has been vouchsafed to us. If the noble Earl, Lord Portsmouth, will pardon me for saying so, he seems to me to have carried official reticence this evening to a point leagues beyond any exhibition of the same kind at which I have ever been present. Of course, we all must admit that there is a great deal of information bearing upon questions of Imperial defence which cannot be given to the public. It is impossible that the public should have revealed to it the whole of the details of the arrangements for the disposition of the military and naval forces of the Crown. But on some occasions figures have been given to Parliament. The imposing figure of 900,000 was freely mentioned as the grand total of the force which would be available for the defence of these islands, and I think we are entitled to know whether that figure, or any figure approaching it, holds the field. Then, again, surely we might be told even approximately something as to the strength of that portion of the Territorial Army which will be available as a mobile force for home defence. After all, we have been told, almost to a man, what the strength of the Expeditionary Force is to be; why should Ministers be so liberal with that information and so niggardly in regard to the information they give to us as to the Home defence force? I sympathise with the position of the noble Earl, for I have myself represented the War Office in your Lordships' House. I do not know whether I have ever taken part in those feats of dexterity to which Lord Lovat referred, but I do recognise that it is sometimes difficult to answer all the questions put to one across the Table. Some of the questions which have been put to the noble Earl this evening, however, seem to me eminently reasonable, and I do trust that, if not to-night, upon some future occasion we shall be given the information desired.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: I can assure your Lordships that I have no desire to conceal information. The noble Marquess used the term "mobile force." I am told by those who are experts in that matter that the term is rather a controversial one, and may be said to apply to one or two things. As regards the figures, the question is how many men we shall get.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: May I explain? What I understood Lord Lovat to ask for was a statement of the number of men who would remain available after the obligatory points had been occupied in sufficient strength.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: That was not the question, but no doubt if the noble Lord will put that Question on the Paper——

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: The Question is on the Paper in those terms. My noble friend asks in his second Question—

> "What will be the total strength of the Territorial Army available as a mobile force for Home defence after the troops allocated to permanent garrisons and coast defence areas have been deducted?"

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: My point was that it is difficult to understand what exactly is meant by the term "mobile force."

*LORD LOVAT: I beg to give the noble Earl notice that I shall raise this question at a later date, when I hope it will be more fully answered.

Motion, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

TRAINING OF DIVISIONAL CAVALRY.

VISCOUNT HAMPDEN: My Lords, I rise to ask the Under-Secretary of State for War whether, taking into consideration the onerous duties that fall on divisional cavalry in time of war, it is the opinion of the Government that this work can be adequately performed by partially-trained troops. This is a subject of great importance, and one which has not been really considered in your Lordships' House. In the debate on the Army Bill the standpoint and the view of the Regular Army were not really considered. We rightly heard a great deal as to the point of view of the Militia, the Yeomanry, and the County Associations, but as to the Regular Army we heard very little. We are told that the duties of the divisional cavalry are light ones, and do not entail using units as units; but theory to a great extent falls to the ground when you get on active service. I am sure noble Lords who have been on active service will agree with me that men sent forth as divisional cavalry will very likely be taken for other duties and other work. Under the present system there is the strategical cavalry moving ahead of the main body. Then there is the screen. According to our present strength there are only two cavalry regiments in the screen, though I admit the number is increased by mounted infantry. But my point is that the strategical cavalry and the screen may be employed far away, and a commanding officer may have no cavalry left except the men given him as divisional cavalry, whom he will consequently have to use as Regular cavalry. You cannot, therefore, look at these men from any other point of view than that of Regular cavalry, and I do not think the training which it is proposed to give them is sufficient to equip them for that work.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: The duties of divisional cavalry in time of war will be limited, as a rule, to the immediate vicinity of the infantry division, and will be less of a collective than of an individual character. They will comprise a great deal of despatch riding, for which, it is thought, intelligent Yeomen will be especially well fitted, and the Army Council consider that a short course of military training will fit Yeomen, who are drawn from a class of intelligence and used to a life in the country, for the duties required of them in forming divisional squadrons. I am quite aware that there has been, and is, a difference of opinion as to the value of this divisional cavalry; but I should just like to mention that there are some very distinguished military men of the highest possible experience and position who have a very high opinion of the efficiency and value of the Yeomanry for this purpose and of the value of the Yeomanry generally. I am afraid I would not be justified in giving the name, but I quote from a letter from a very high authority which I have received—

> "For some descriptions of active service I would almost as soon have a good Yeomanry regiment as a regiment of line cavalry. Or, to put the point still more definitely, I would as soon have four squadrons of Yeomanry as three of cavalry."

LORD NEWTON: Is the authority Major Seely?

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH shook his head in dissent.

ADVERTISEMENTS REGULATION BILL.

BRITISH NORTH AMERICA BILL.

Amendments reported (according to order); and Bills to be read 3ª to-morrow.

House adjourned at ten minutes past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 17th July, 1907.

The House met at quarter before Three of the Clock.

New Writ for the County of Wicklow (East Wicklow Division), in the room of Denis Joseph Cogan, esquire (Chiltern Hundreds).—(*Captain Donelan.*)

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

City of London (Union of Parishes) Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill.—Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Portobello and Musselburgh Tramways (Levenhall Extension) Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill.—Considered; to be read the third time upon Friday.

North British Railway Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to: London and North Western Railway Bill; Worthing Gas Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to: Devonport Corporation Bill [Lords]; Tees Valley Water (Consolidation) Bill [Lords]; Kendal Corporation Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

PETITIONS.

SMALL LANDHOLDERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against: From Easter Ross; Edinburgh; Inverness; and, Teviotdale; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CROWN LANDS ACT, 1906.

Paper [presented 16th July] to be printed. [No. 253.]

NAVY (COURTS MARTIAL).

Copy presented, of Return of the Number of Courts Martial held and Summary Punishments inflicted during the year 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVY (EXCEPTIONS TO KING'S REGULATIONS).

Copy presented, of List of Exceptions to the King's Regulations as to Pay, Non-effective Pay, and Allowances during year 1906–7 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC INCOME AND EXPENDITURE.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 11th July: Sir Henry Fowler]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 254.]

TREATY SERIES (No. 20, 1907).

Copy presented, of Accession of Cuba, Dominican Republic, Hayti, and Paraguay to the Convention, signed at Geneva, 22nd August, 1864, for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded in Armies in the Field, 6th July, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SUGAR CONVENTION (No. 7, 1907).

Copy presented, of Report of Proceedings of the International Sugar Commission, Spring Session, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No. 3859 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Inquiry into Charities (County of Wilts).—Further Return relative thereto [ordered 9th August, 1901; Mr. Griffith-Boscawen] to be printed. [No. 255.]

PAUPERS AND DEPENDANTS (SCOTLAND).

Return ordered, "showing the number of all ordinary Poor and their Dependants chargeable to Parish Councils in Scotland during the year ended the 15th day of May, 1907, including poor relieved whose Settlements were undetermined at the 15th day of May, 1907, classified in the following forms:—

(1) Aggregate period of chargeability and number of times relieved, distinguishing (*a*) persons relieved wholly in institutions; (*b*) persons relieved wholly outside institutions; (*c*) other persons relieved; and also distinguishing, in the case of each of these classes (1) male adults; (2) female adults; (3) children.

Aggregate period of chargeability of individual paupers during the year.	Paupers.						Dependants.					
	Number of times chargeable during the year.						Number of times chargeable during the year.					
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5 or more.	Total.	1.	2.	3.	4.	5 or more.	Total.
Not exceeding one week												
Over 1 week and not exceeding 4 weeks												
Over 4 weeks and not exceeding 13 weeks												
Over 13 weeks and not exceeding 26 weeks												
Over 26 weeks and not exceeding 39 weeks												
Over 39 weeks, but less than one year												
Whole year												
Total												

(2) Ages and sex, distinguishing (*a*) persons relieved singly; (*b*) families—(1) heads of families, (2) dependants.

Age Groups.	Males.	Females.
Under 3 years		
3 years and under 14 years		
14 years and under 16 years		
16 years and under 20 years		
20 years and under 25 years		
25 years and under 35 years		
35 years and under 45 years		
45 years and under 55 years		
55 years and under 60 years		
60 years and under 65 years		
65 years and under 75 years		
75 years and upwards		
Total		

TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS.

Returns ordered, "(1) From each Savings Bank in England and Wales, Scotland, Ireland, and the Channel Islands, containing, in columns, the names of the Officers, their respective salaries, and other allowances, if any; the amount of security each gives; the annual expenses of management, inclusive of all payments and salaries, for the year ended the 20th day of November, 1906; the rate per centum per annum on the capital of the Bank for the expenses of management; the rate of interest paid to depositors on the various amounts of deposit, and the average rate of interest on all accounts; the number of accounts remaining open; the total amount owing to depositors; the total amount invested with the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt; the balance in the hands of the Treasurer at the 20th day of November, 1906; the total amount of the separate Surplus Fund on the 20th day of November, 1906; other assets, including estimated value of Bank premises, furniture, etc.; the total assets; the total amount of Government Stock standing to the credit of depositors; the number and amount of annuities granted; and the average cost of each transaction; also the year in which business commenced in each Bank, and the name of the day or days, and the number of hours in the week, on which the Banks are open for the deposit and withdrawal of moneys; including in such Return a list of all such Savings Banks as, under the provisions of the Act 26 Vict., c. 14, or otherwise, have been closed and have transferred their funds, or any part thereof, to the Post Office Savings Banks; showing, in each case, the number of such Banks, as well as the number and amount of depositors' accounts so transferred, and the amount of compensation, if any, made to all or any of the Officers of such Banks respectively; and showing also the years in which such Banks were respectively opened and closed, and the number and amount of their Depositors' balances, and the number of days and hours in each week on which the same Banks were open for public business at the close of the year next preceding the date of such closing; distinguishing the same, as in the Return, for each separate county, as well as collectively, for England and Wales, Scotland, Ireland, and the Channel Islands, and for the United Kingdom; and (2) for the year ending the 20th day of November, 1906, showing the total number of depositors in Trustee Savings Banks; the total number of deposits; the average amount of each deposit account; the average sums paid in and drawn out; the total number of persons who have deposited in single sums the entire amount allowed to be deposited during the year (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 286, of Session 1906)."—(*Sir Frederick Banbury.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Fatal Accidents.

MR. LAIDLAW (Renfrewshire, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many fatal accidents were reported as having occurred in the United Kingdom in the years 1904, 1905, and 1906, respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The number of deaths in England and Wales due to accident or negligence was 10,902 in 1904 and 10,829 in 1905. The figures for 1906 are not yet available. The number in Ireland was 1,675 in 1904 and 1,588 in 1905; the number in Scotland in 1904 (the last year for which figures can be given) was 2,594.

Navy—Distinguishing Badge for Electricians.

MR. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what is the distinguishing badge worn by electricians in His Majesty's Navy; what are their special duties apart from those usually performed by leading torpedo men in ships and vessels; are candidates for these positions required to present indentures of apprenticeship to such special work; and, if not, what are the qualifications necessary.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) Electricians wear the distinctive gilt buttons indicative of the rating of chief petty officer, and the same distinctive cap badge as engine-room artificers, but (like engine-room artificers) they wear no distinctive badges indicative of special qualifications or duties on collar and cuff. The work of electricians is to carry out all necessary repairs to electrical apparatus. Candidates are nor required to present indentures of apprenticeship to the trade, but three years' practical experience as fitter and turner is necessary. The qualifications required are:—

> *Theoretical.*—Knowledge of general construction of electrical apparatus, motors, etc., and of simple testing;
>
> *Practical.*—Re-lining and adjusting bearings; using a lathe; screw-cutting test for bolt and nut; repairs

to any part of electrical apparatus and instruments, motors, etc.

There is also an educational test in reading, dictation, vulgar and decimal fractions, and simple interest.

Meetings of Commissioners for Charitable Donations and Bequests (Ireland).

Mr. J. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland how often did the Commissioners for Charitable Donations and Bequests in Ireland meet during the twelve months preceding 23rd November, 1906, to consider applications under Section 2 of 30 and 31 Vict., c. 54, and business incidental thereto; how many such meetings were attended by each of the Commissioners; and whether the Commissioners are entitled to decline to state to applicants any ground for their refusal to give an opinion or advise.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners inform me that during the twelve months preceding 23rd November, 1906, they considered applications under the section quoted at five of their ordinary meetings. The Commissioners do not consider that any useful public purpose would be served by publishing the names of the particular members of their body who were present at these meetings. The Commissioners hold that the statute which governs their proceedings casts no obligation upon them to state the grounds of their refusal to give an opinion or advice.

Ayrshire Foundry Company and the Admiralty.

Mr. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether any reward has been conferred upon the workman from the Ayrshire Foundry Company who first drew the attention of the Admiralty to the fraud committed by that company, whereby a battleship, costing nearly £2,000,000 sterling, and its crew of over 700 men might have been lost; and, if so, what was the nature and the amount of the reward; and, if not, why.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The hon. Member's Question relates to transactions which took place long before the present Board came into office. I am told that the Admiralty was first informed of the defect in the rudder by a person who had been employed as works manager by the Ayrshire Foundry Company, but had left the firm's employment at the time of furnishing the information. According to his own statement, he had known for many months of this defect, and had himself, although under protest, assisted in concealing it. Under the circumstances it did not appear to the Board of Admiralty of the day that he ought to be rewarded, and no reward has been made.

Tobacco Revenue.

Mr. LEA: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state the gross and net tobacco revenue and the amount estimated for in the financial year 1906–7.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The following statement shows the gross and net tobacco revenue and the amount estimated for in the financial year, 1906–7.

	£
Gross Revenue - - -	14,507,640
Net Revenue - - -	13,295,803
Estimated Revenue - -	13,550,000

Loans to Self-Governing Colonies.

Mr. WALROND (Devonshire, Tiverton): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what was the earliest date upon which a loan was guaranteed by the Imperial Government in favour of a self-governing Colony.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) In 1857, when a New Zealand loan of £500,000 was guaranteed.

Mr. WALROND: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, what is the total amount of the loans of self-governing Colonies guaranteed by the Imperial Government during the last fifty years.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) £8,900,000.

Sale of Irish Estates—Offers Refused.

Mr. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will ascertain and state, in respect of the three cases in which the Estates Commissioners' offer for estates in the Land Judge's Court has been refused and in respect of the eleven cases in which the Commissioners' offers are still pending, the names of the estates, the counties in which they are situate, and the dates of the offers.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Cases in which proposals by the Estates Commissioners to purchase estates, under Section 7 of the Irish Land Act, 1903, have been refused by the Land Judge :—

Estate.	County.	Date of Proposal.
1. J. Golden - - - - - -	Cork	15th February, 1905
2. J. W. Madden - - - - -	Mayo	18th July, 1906
3. H. Moore - - - - - -	Kilkenny	15th October, 1906

Cases in which proposals by Estates Commissioners to purchase estates, under Section 7 of the Irish Land Act, 1903, are pending before the Land Judge :—

Estate.	County.	Date of Proposal.
1. W. H. Parker - - - -	Waterford	15th October, 1906*
2. H. F. Palmer - - - - -	Queen's	15th October, 1906†
3. Assignees of D. F. Leahy - - -	Cork	15th February, 1907‡
4. R. H. Barter - - - - -	Cork	5th April, 1907
5. C. D. O'Rorke - - - - -	Galway	25th April, 1907
6. William Bournes and another - -	Mayo	27th March, 1907
7. P. J. Creeden - - - - -	Cork	1st May, 1907
8. A. S. Arthur - - - - -	Longford	2nd May, 1907
9. A. Studdert and others - - -	Tipperary	15th May, 1907
10. M. V. N. Bagot - - - - -	Roscommon	13th June, 1907

In the remaining case referred to in the Answer of 27th June the Land Judge has since accepted the Commissioners' offer.

* Amended proposal in course of preparation.

† Awaiting settlement of question affecting superior interests.

‡ Awaiting lodgment of undertakings, signed by not less than three-fourths of the tenants, to purchase their holdings.

MR. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will ascertain and set forth fully the several reasons for which the Estates Commissioners have so far held in cases within the Act and good on the merits, that the applicants as evicted tenants are not fit and proper persons to become purchasers under the Land Purchase Acts; and, where the reason is age, sex, infirmity, or other cause not affecting the merits of the claim, how and when do the Government propose to afford relief.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The several grounds on which the Estates Commissioners have rejected applications are fully set out in the twentieth paragraph of their Special Report on evicted tenants. As regards the latter part of the Question, I would refer to my reply to the hon. Member's previous Question on 26th June.†

Allocation of Royal Irish Constabulary.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the number of the Royal Irish Constabulary allocated to each county and county borough in Ireland; when was the last allocation or revision made, and by whom; is the cost of the entire number included in the annual Parliamentary Estimates; what are the charges of which payment is required from the county councils in respect of extra police; and what are the rates of expenses allowed to officers and men of the extra police force sent temporarily to any district over and above their usual pay and allowances, and over and above the actual railway fares or car hire necessary to transfer them.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The distribution of the free force of the Royal Irish Constabulary was fixed, for the ensuing three years, by Order in Council of 18th May, 1906. The distribution was as follows:—

Counties.			Sergeants and Constables.
Antrim			241
Armagh			185
Carlow			83
Cavan			169
Clare			367
Cork	East Riding	453	701
	West Riding	248	
Donegal			348
Down			253
Dublin			164
Fermanagh			130
Galway	East Riding	313	616
	West Riding	303	
Kerry			361
Kildare			142
Kilkenny			225
King's County			164
Leitrim			147
Limerick			303
Londonderry			122
Longford			110
Louth			126
Mayo			403
Meath			172
Monaghan			123
Queen's County			131
Roscommon			256
Sligo			206
Tipperary	North Riding	203	452
	South Riding	249	
Tyrone			222
Waterford			174
Westmeath			190
Wexford			192
Wicklow			152
			7,630

Counties	7,630
Cities:	
Belfast	500
Cork	175
Limerick	85
Londonderry	90
Waterford	73
Total Sergeants and Constables	8,553

The cost of the entire number so distributed is included in the Estimates. The statutory charges upon local authorities in respect of extra police are, for each district inspector, at the rate of £92 3s. 6d. per annum; for each head constable, at the rate of £43 6s.; and for each man of lower rank, at the rate of £34 9s. 3d. When officers and men are sent for temporary duty outside their own counties they receive their travelling expenses but no other allowances except when there is no barrack accommodation for them. In such case the three classes before mentioned receive a nightly subsistence allowance of 15s., 4s. 6d., and 3s. 6d. respectively.

Irish Schools—Annual Inspections.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if instructions are given to the inspectors of the National Board of Education to consider carefully the circumstances of the school and the class of children attending when making their annual inspections; and, if not, will he consider the necessity that exists for such instructions.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxvi., 1394.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that the Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative.

Insurance of Irish National School Teachers.

Mr. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can now state whether the National Board of Education will undertake the insurance of national school teachers under the Workmen's Compensation Act, which came into operation on the 1st instant.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I must refer the hon. Member to the Answer I gave on this subject on the 27th ultimo.†

Appointment of District Inspector O'Shee as Adjutant of Royal Irish Constabulary.

Mr. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state on what grounds District Inspector O'Shee was selected for the position of adjutant; whether he is a first or a second-class district inspector, and what place he holds on the seniority list; what are the extra emoluments, financial and otherwise, attaching to the position; whether it was previously offered to any senior officer; and whether this post in the Royal Irish Constabulary was ever before held by a second-class district inspector, and, if so, on what occasion.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Inspector-General informs me that he appointed District Inspector O'Shee to be adjuant as being, in his opinion, the officer best fitted for the post. Mr. O'Shee is second in seniority of the second-class district inspectors. The adjutant receives a special allowance of 4s. a day, and is provided with an unfurnished residence. The Inspector-General did not offer the post to any other officer. He is not aware that it was ever before held by a second-class district inspector.

Mr. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that District Inspector O'Shee, stationed at the constabulary depot, recently charged and punished Constable Fanning of the Royal Irish Constabulary band for alleged drunkenness, in direct contravention of the code which provides that every charge of drunkenness must be submitted to the Inspector-General; that the Inspector-General has acquitted the constable, and expressed his regret that the charge was made; and whether, seeing that the punishment inflicted by the district inspector, viz., a stoppage of the constable's band fees, is continued against Constable Fanning on a charge of careless playing, he will say when this charge was brought for the first time, and what opportunity the constable was afforded of vindicating his character.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The bandmaster reported Constable Fanning for having neglected to play his instrument during a public performance of the band, and stated that the constable appeared to be under the influence of drink at the time. The adjutant admonished the constable, and expressed the intention of punishing him by temporarily stopping his band fees. The constable appealed, and an inquiry was held, as the result of which the Inspector-General exonerated the constable as regards the alleged drinking, but confirmed the stoppage of his band fees for carelessness whilst the band was playing. A previous complaint had been made against the constable in connection with his musical duties. The constable will have full opportunity of redeeming his character by performing his duty properly in future.

British Museum—Literary Section.

Mr. GINNELL: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury are all the members of the staff of the literary section of the British Museum now receiving full pay; if so, how are they occupied; and will he obtain from them an approximate estimate of the cost of that section, including books, manuscripts, reading rooms, and newspapers in the last completed year, the amount of this covered by Parliamentary Vote, and the amount, if any, defrayed from other sources.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxvii., 118–119.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) If by the "literary section" of the British Museum is meant the departments of printed books (including the reading room and newspaper room), Oriental printed books and manuscripts, and manuscripts, I am informed that all the members of the staff are now receiving full pay, and are occupied with multifarious duties, which cannot well be defined with precision and brevity. The higher officials are mainly engaged in administrative work, the preservation, arrangement, and development of the collections, indexing and cataloguing, and the preparation of publications, whilst the members of the lower grades act as attendants and messengers. The approximate cost of these departments in the last completed year (1906–7) was—

Department.	Salaries.	Purchases.	Bookbinding, etc.	Printing, etc., catalogues.
	£	£	£	£
Printed Books - - - -	19,451	7,018	7,800	2,231
Oriental printed books and manuscripts - - - -	2,495	902	242	267
Manuscripts - - - -	5,480	2,423	599	1,112

The sum of £175 was contributed by the Bridgewater Fund towards the salary of the Keeper of the Manuscripts, and £668 11s. 9d. from the Bridgewater and Farnborough Funds were spent in the purchase of manuscripts. With the exception of these amounts the expenditure shown above was covered by the Parliamentary Vote.

Scottish Firms and Admiralty Clothing Contracts.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if any of the contracts connected with the clothing of the Navy (purchase of cloth, materials, etc.) were in the past year placed in Scotland; and, if so, to what extent.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) Contracts for clothing and clothing materials to the approximate total value of £23,750 were placed with Scottish firms during 1906–7.

Hours and Pay of Dublin Outdoor Docket Telegraph Messengers.

MR. J. P. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): To ask the Postmaster-General whether outdoor docket telegraph messengers employed in the General Post Office, Dublin, work eight hours per day (forty-eight hours per week), the same number of hours as sorters, telegraphists, and postmen, and are paid at the rate of 8d. per dozen messages (which is piece work) and on the seventh day of the week, when they are on Sunday duty, they are paid at overtime rate, which is less than 1¼d. per hour; whether those lads work in three batches on Sundays, and are paid at the following rate, namely: 1st batch, four hours, 5d.; 2nd batch, five hours, 6d.; 3rd batch, eight hours, 9d.; and whether, in view of his previous statements that outdoor docket telegraph messengers receive no payment for Sunday attendances not exceeding eight hours in four weeks, and in view of the character of this payment, he will recommend a higher rate for those boys when employed on Sunday duties.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I will have an inquiry made upon the subject and will acquaint the hon. Member with the result.

Preference for Telephone Calls over Telegrams at Bristol.

MR. W. T. WILSON (Lancashire, Westhoughton): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that instructions have been given at the Bristol telegraph office that the staff on duty between certain hours must, should telegraphic messages be waiting, allow them to be delayed, first giving preference to all telephone work, particularly trunk calls; whether such orders have been issued by his direction; and whether he will state why the senders of telegrams are to be penalised in this manner.

MR. W. T. WILSON: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that on Tuesday, 9th July, upon the arrival of an American mail at the Bristol post office, telegraphists were removed from their duties and sent to deal with letters; whether in consequence delay took place on telegrams; and whether, in view of the fact that the telegrams contain messages of importance to the senders, he will direct that they are not, in future, to be delayed in order that the staff may deal with newspapers and letters.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I will have inquiry made upon the subject of these two Questions.

Schoolmasters in County of Durham Holding other Offices.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): To ask the President of the Board of Education if he can state the number of schoolmasters in the county of Durban who are holding other offices beside that of schoolmaster.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) I have no information on this matter.

Loans to Self-Governing Colonies.

MR. WALROND: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will set out the purposes and objects for which loans have been guaranteed by the Imperial Government to self-governing Colonies, at what rate such loans were issued and guaranteed, and what sum thus guaranteed still remains outstanding.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*)—

Date.	Colony.	Amount of loan.	Purpose of loan.	Rate of interest.	Net amount outstanding on 31st March, 1907.		
		£		Per cent.	£	*s.*	*d.*
1857	New Zealand	500,000	Payments of debts due by the Colony and purchase of Native lands.	4	Nil		
1866	New Zealand	500,000	Expenses in connection with the New Zealand War, immigration, and other purposes.	4	Nil		
1867	Canada -	3,000,000	Construction of railway connecting Quebec and Halifax.	4	328,940	11	5
1869	Canada -	300,000	Purchase of Rupert's Land from Hudson's Bay Company.	4	Nil		
1870	New Zealand	1,000,000	Immigration and construction of roads, bridges, and other communications.	4	34,481	7	0
1873	Canada -	3,600,000	Construction of the Pacific Railway and improvement of canals.	4	1,905,558	9	2

The net amount outstanding is in each case taken to be the gross sum outstanding, less the nominal amount of the securities held on account of Sinking Fund.

Inquiry into Case of Eital Præsad, Inspector of Police in Bengal.

MR. HERBERT (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that irregularities appear to have taken place during the inquiry into the conduct of Eital Præsad, an inspector of police in Bengal, as a result of which he was dismissed the service; and whether he will cause an inquiry to be made into the circumstances.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I have no official information as to the case. I understand that the person referred to has addressed a memorial to the Government of India, and, if he is dissatisfied with their decision, he is at liberty to appeal to me, when the matter would be duly considered.

Scotch Firms and Army Clothing Contracts.

MR. WATT: To ask the Secretary of State for War if any of the contracts connected with the clothing of the Regular Army and the Militia were in the past year placed in Scotland; and, if so, to what extent.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Contracts for the following articles were placed with Scottish firms during the past financial year:—

Supply.	Quantity.
Cloth, drab mixture, great coat	1,000 yards.
Tartan, drab mixture	90,000 ,,
Tartan, Highland	30,620 ,,
Bedford cord	5,700 ,,
Staying canvas	460,000 ,,
Sheeting flax	40,000 ,,
Duck, various	84,750 ,,
Linen, black	8,500 ,,
Glengarry caps	31,246
Highland scarves	73
Coats, I.R.	3,060
Leggings	1,200
Woollen drawers	81,137
Kit bags	31,500
Sewing thread	90,000 skeins.
Machine thread	58,000 reels.
Sewing cotton	1,656 ,,

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

The Empire and the Flag.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is yet in a position to state the intentions of His Majesty's Government with regard to the laying down of special vessels for the purpose of showing the flag in outlying portions of the Empire and the performance of detached police duties.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): The shipbuilding programme for next year is in course of being considered, and I will take care that the point referred to by the hon. Gentleman shall not be lost sight of.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): Is it intended that any warship bigger than a gunboat shall patrol, or, at any rate, occasionally visit, the Persian Gulf?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I can make no definite statement.

New Royal Yacht.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if any compensation was paid to Messrs. Inglis, the builders of the royal yacht on account of their having been deprived of the sub-contract for upholstery and internal decoration; and, if so, how much; and if he is aware that the decorative designer of the upholstery and internal work of the "Victoria and Albert," executed by Warings, was the same man, Mr. F. S. Murray, who designed the work for the Glasgow sub-contractor who was deprived of the contract on the pressure of the Admiralty.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: My hon. friend of course understands that his Question refers to transactions which took place before the present Government came into office. I am informed that it has never been admitted that Messrs. Inglis were deprived of any sub-contract for upholstery, etc., as alleged in the Question, and no compensation has in fact been paid to them. In answer to the third Question, the Admiralty have no information on the subject.

MR. WATT: Was not Mr. Murray engaged for the same class of work by Messrs. Waring?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I have no information.

Naval Drills.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the Admiralty contemplates or has ordered a re-introduction into the Royal Navy of sail-drill and mast-and-yard exercises for purposes of training; and, if so, in what manner, at what time, and to what extent will this re-introduction be carried out.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The Answer is in the negative.

H.M.S. "Scylla."

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether His Majesty's cruiser "Scylla," which is at present charged with the sole responsibility of carrying the flag in the Carribean, is entirely in an efficient state as regards the condition of the ship and the health of the crew to discharge that responsibility.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: According to the latest reports the condition of the "Scylla" and the health of her crew are in all respects satisfactory.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: Can the right hon. Gentleman say when the vessel was last docked and what percentage of the men were in the sick bay last week?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON asked for notice.

Railway Fares for Volunteer Officers.

MR. STARKEY (Nottinghamshire, Newark): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether railway companies are obliged to supply a Volunteer officer travelling on duty with a return ticket at a single fare; and, if so, whether he would take action in the case of an officer proceeding in obedience to command orders to present himself for examination who was refused this privilege.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): Railway companies are not obliged to take officers of Volunteers at single fares for the return journey. The Cheap Train Act only provides for payment at three-quarters of the fare charged to the public. Any arrangements for the payment of smaller fares than this are the result of voluntary concessions on the part of the railway companies.

The Artillery.

MR. LEVERTON HARRIS (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the decision to reduce the Royal Horse and Foot Artillery by sixty-seven officers and 3,712 of other ranks has been reconsidered; and whether he now proposes to abandon the reduction of the establishment of this arm.

I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for War what addition has, up to the present date, been made to the strength of the Royal Horse and Foot Artillery to compensate for the reduction of sixty-seven officers and 3,712 men of the establishment of the regular branch of that arm; and whether, in fact, a single officer, non-commissioned officer, or man has yet been added.

MR. HALDANE: In reply to these Questions I have nothing whatever to add to what I have stated over and over again. I must refer the hon. Member to my reply to a Question put by the right hon. Member for Croydon on the 1st instant.† The second Question of the hon. Member is unintelligible. In this Question he seems to suggest that reductions have actually taken place. His first Question proceeds on the footing that they have not.

Native Reservations in East Africa.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state the extent of land which has been reserved for the Natives in the Kikuyu district in East Africa: and if it is clearly understood that this reserve will be retained for the natives.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): The land which has been declared reserves for the Kikuyu tribe amounts to about 14,000 square miles in the Kenya Province, and about 350,000 acres in the Ukamba Province. There is no present intention of rescinding this reservation.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxvii., 346–7.

MR. CATHCART WASON: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it is not within his knowledge that practically all the native troubles have arisen through land grabbing, and would it not tend to the peace of that country——

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must give notice of that Question.

MR. CATHCART WASON: Will the right hon. Gentleman take this matter into consideration and see into it?

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must give notice.

MR. MYER (Lambeth, N.): Will the right hon. Gentleman take steps to render the sale of reserved lands——?

*MR. SPEAKER: That does not arise out of the Question.

MR. CATHCART WASON asked what the right hon. Gentleman meant by "no present intention."

MR. CHURCHILL: Some of these tribes have hitherto pursued a perfectly nomadic course over large areas of country; but it is the absolute intention of my right hon. friend the Colonial Secretary to secure for them ample location in which they may live and multiply.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was not aware that the Kikuyu was not a nomadic tribe; and whether it would not be possible to place their lands in the hands of trustees so that they should not be alienated.

*MR. SPEAKER: That is a matter of policy; and hon. Members must give notice of all such important Questions.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state the extent of land from which the Masai were removed for the benefit of a syndicate, and a comparative estimate of members of the Masai; and how many English, Irish, and Scottish settlers have replaced the Masai.

MR. CHURCHILL: The area from which the Masai were removed was nominally about 920,000 acres. I say "nominally" because the Masai, being a nomad pastoral tribe and having no fixed abode, occupied at one time or another all grazing land in that part of East Africa, the areas so occupied being however very much in excess of their present requirements. Three hundred and twenty thousand acres of the land in question were granted to the East Africa Syndicate and the remainder made available for other settlers. The Masai affected by this arrangement numbered about 11,200 souls. The number of white settlers in the area is at present forty-eight, of whom ten are Boers and the remainder of British descent, but this number will no doubt be increased as white settlement progresses. I should add that the Masai have been granted ample lands in two reserves, and that they have acquiesced in the arrangement.

MR. CATHCART WASON: Do the forty-eight settlers include women and children?

MR. CHURCHILL: I believe not.

East Indians at Trinidad.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, if he can state the number of identured East Indian immigrants entering Trinidad for the past two years who have been charged with and punished for crime; whether the cost of such prosecutions is borne by the estates employing them or by the Government; and, if by the latter, could he state the total cost of such prosecutions to the Government for the said two years.

MR. CHURCHILL: The annual Returns furnished by the Trinidad Government do not specify the number of indentured immigrants punished for crime. The number of natives of India punished for various offences in the two years 1904–5 and 1905–6 was 4,640 out of a total East Indian population exceeding 98,000. Of these 3,565 were punished for breaches of the Immigration Ordinance. The cost of these prosecutions cannot be ascertained without reference to the Colony; and it is doubtful whether the proportion of the cost borne by the Government on this account can be separated from the total cost of the judicial and police services of the Colony.

*MR. REES asked whether, seeing that breaches of the Immigration Ordinance are merely technical offences, there was any reason to believe that crime was more rife among East Indians than among any other class of the community?

MR. CHURCHILL: No, Sir; I believe that in matters of morality and public order they have proved themselves to be a very law-abiding people.

MR. SUMMERBELL: Can the right hon. Gentleman state the cost of the prosecutions?

MR. CHURCHILL: No, Sir, but I will inquire.

Trinidad Railway Employees.

MR. SUMMERBELL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state whether the Secretary of State for the Colonies has recently received from the Working Men's Association of Trinidad a communication calling attention to the discontent now existing amongst the railway employees of that Colony as to their conditions of service; and, if so, whether he could state if it is the intention of the Government to take any action as to any of the points raised by the said association.

MR. CHURCHILL: The communication to which the hon. Member refers has been received. The Secretary of State is not at present prepared to admit that the railway employees in Trinidad have valid ground for discontent, but he will consult the Governor on the subject.

Winnipeg Unemployed.

MR. CLYNES (Manchester, N.E.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can make any statement respecting the number of men unemployed in Winnipeg; and whether, seeing that immigrants from this country are regularly adding to the number, he can take any action concerning the statements of emigration agencies and others which mislead people who go to Canada for employment.

MR. CHURCHILL: No, Sir, I am not aware that there is any number of unemployed in Winnipeg. Employment in Canada generally is easy to get on farms and on railway construction.

British Troops in Johannesburg.

MR. MOND (Chester): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the fact that the British troops in Johannesburg were called out several times during last week; and whether he can state the circumstances for which their services were employed.

MR. CHURCHILL: The latest official information at my disposal is that the Infantry have been withdrawn, but that 800 mounted troops remain to support the police. I have no information yet as to the occurrences of last week.

MR. MOND: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether on the Rand a police officer without any civil intervention can call upon the British troops to fire upon an assembly of more than six persons, after having commanded them three times to disperse; and whether he will draw the attention of the Transvaal Government to the fact that such practice is not in accordance with the law in Great Britain, and that His Majesty's Government cannot agree to the use of British troops under such circumstances.

MR. CHURCHILL: I do not think that the law is correctly stated in the Question. Responsibility for firing must, as I understand, still rest with the officer commanding the troops as it does in this country.

Labour in the Transvaal Mines.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any, and, if so, what, conditions governing the importation of labour into the Transvaal prevent the employment of British subjects, other than Asiatics, in the Transvaal mines.

MR. CHURCHILL: The hon. Member will forgive me for saying that I find some difficulty in answering his Question, because without further explanation the point is somewhat obscure, but I think I am justified in saying that I know of no such conditions.

New Hebrides Punitive Expedition.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether a punitive expedition has been landed in one of the islands of the New Hebrides from His Majesty's cruiser "Cambrian"; and, if so, whether he can give the House any information regarding it.

MR. CHURCHILL: I understand from the Admiralty that one sailor was killed during the course of a disturbance in the island of Malekula. His Majesty's Government have no further information on the subject at present.

Tea Duty.

MR. LEVERTON HARRIS: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what was the average contribution per head of the population of the United Kingdom towards the duty paid on tea during the year ending 31st March, 1907.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fife, E.): 2s. 6·72d.

Dartmoor Convicts—Treatment of Recaptured Prisoners.

MR. HAZLETON (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether Alfred Lincoln, who attacked Principal Warder Alford while working on the Dartmoor Prison farm on 8th June, and Michael Hogan, who assaulted Assistant Warder-Nurse Brown in the casual sick hospital on 1st July, were each ordered to receive eighteen strokes with the cat, to undergo dietary punishment, to wear chains for six months, and to wear the black dress; whether he confirmed those sentences inflicting flogging upon these two men; and whether those sentences have since been carried out.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): The sentence on each of the convicts mentioned was to undergo a corporal punishment of eighteen strokes with the cat, and to forfeit certain marks. No dietary punishment was awarded in either case. The convicts were ordered to be placed in the distinctive dress worn by prisoners who assault or attempt to assault officers, and to be restrained in leg chains or cross irons. This is a necessary measure of precaution; the chains or irons are not necessarily worn for six months, but only so long as the directors deem advisable and according to the conduct of the prisoner. Six months is the maximum limit; as a rule the time is shorter. The Answer to the last two paragraphs is in the affirmative.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): May I ask if the right hon. Gentleman will be good enough to inquire whether there is really any necessity for placing these men, who have already been severely punished, in chains and especially in leg chains?

*MR. GLADSTONE: It is a precaution necessitated by the fact that they have used violence to officers.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: May I ask whether the right hon. Gentleman is not aware that the practice of putting aboriginal prisoners in chains in Australia has been severely condemned, and whether in view of that condemnation the placing of prisoners in chains in this country will be allowed to continue?

*MR. GLADSTONE: These cases are exceptional and necessitate exceptional measures for the protection of the officers.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): By what authority were the sentences passed?

MR. GLADSTONE: I should like notice of that Question.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: But that is in the Question.

MR. GLADSTONE: Of course, the sentences have to come to me for confirmation.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Are the sentences first of all adjudicated upon by magistrates?

MR. GLADSTONE: Yes.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Will the right hon. Gentleman give me the names of those magistrates?

*MR. SPEAKER: I think the hon. Member must give notice of that.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): But that is in the Question.

*MR. SPEAKER: We are discussing Question 35.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I beg pardon, I see it is in the next Question.

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): Is the right hon. Gentleman able to say if the dietary punishment which these prisoners have to undergo is three days bread and water, or a longer period?

*MR. GLADSTONE: I believe in this particular case there was no dietary punishment awarded.

MR. HAZLETON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether two convicts, Thomas Ellis and Alfred Parrish, who were convicted in North London, and who eluded capture on Dartmoor for thirty hours, were ordered nine days bread and water diet and twenty-one days No. 2 diet, to lose all marks which would count for remission of sentence, to wear chains for six months, and also to wear a yellow dress, by the visiting board of magistrates; and, if so, whether he will state the names of the magistrates who inflicted these five separate punishments upon each of these convicts; what is the weight of the chains they have been condemned to wear; and for how long a period every day have they to wear these chains.

*MR. GLADSTONE: The terms of the sentences are not accurately stated in the hon. Member's Question. There are not "five separate punishments"; each convict's sentence is a period of punishment diet and a forfeiture of marks. The bread-and-water diet, however, is imposed only for six days—two terms of three days each, and the convicts do not forfeit the whole of their remission, but only marks equivalent to six months. In addition, not as punishment but as a measure of precaution, they have been ordered to wear the distinctive dress for convicts who escape or attempt to escape, and to be restrained in "chains" or cross-irons. The last is a necessary precaution; but the maximum time that the chains are worn is six months, and they may be, and in most cases are, discontinued sooner. Every case of restraint is considered by the directors once a month, and the restraint is continued only if absolutely necessary in the interest of security. The chains weigh from 4½ to 6 lbs. They are worn continuously, but the leather belt by which they are fastened round the waist can be undone at night or at meals, thus allowing the chains to slip down. The names of the visitors were Lord Seaton, Vice-Admiral Wilson, Mr. Walter Wilson and Colonel W. G. Armstrong. Under the circumstances I consider the sentences proper ones and not severe for an attempt to escape which was almost successful.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Liberal cheers for chains!

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Will the right hon. Gentleman be willing to place in the tea-room samples of the chains which were used, and will he give an explanation of what is the meaning of the cross-iron?

*MR. GLADSTONE: I see no necessity for adopting the course suggested by the hon. Member.

Chester Vaccination Prosecution.

MR. MOND: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the fact that, in the Chester City Police Court on Wednesday, 3rd July, 1907, upon the hearing of an information under the Vaccination Acts against Thomas Bowden, a threat was made both by the magistrate's chief clerk and the chief constable that, in consequence thereof, his licence as a lodging-house keeper might be taken from him; and whether he will take the necessary steps to prevent any such course, seeing that no provision for it is authorised by any Act of Parliament, and the prescribed penalties under the Vaccination Acts are being imposed upon the defaulter.

*MR. GLADSTONE: It appears that on the 3rd inst. an Order was made for a child of Thomas Bowden to be vaccinated within twenty-eight days, and no further proceedings have been taken. The clerk to the justices remarked that as Bowden kept a common lodging-house, possibly the corporation committee might consider the question of refusing the licence if the child was not vaccinated, and the chief constable acquiesced in this remark. No threat was made, and the clerk has no control over the committee who deal with the licensing of lodging-houses. I cannot take any action in the matter.

*MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) asked if it was legal for a clerk to make such observations in order to intimidate an anti-vaccinator?

*MR. GLADSTONE was understood to reply that he could not control the observations of people in Court.

Importation of Trachoma.

MR. LEVERTON HARRIS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the increase in cases entering hospitals suffering from trachoma; and what steps are being taken to prevent the spread of this contagious disease.

*MR. GLADSTONE: Trachoma comes within my jurisdiction only so far as the operation of the Aliens Act is concerned. It is a disease on account of which alien passengers who are subject to the provisions of that Act may be excluded from this country; and since that Act came into force numerous cases have been excluded.

Conscientious Objectors' Fees.

MR. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in view of the fact that, under the present law, the fees which conscientious objectors to vaccination have to pay for exemption certificates are public moneys, he will say why it is proposed that part of the fees for making the statutory declaration which it is proposed to substitute for these certificates shall go to commissioners for oaths and other private persons.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): Justices' clerks are remunerated by salary, and any fees received by them have to be paid over to the fund from which the salary is defrayed. Commissioners for oaths do not receive any salary, and consequently they retain the fees paid to them.

Post Office Contracts.

MR. CLYNES: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether firms having contracts with his Department are asked to comply with the terms of the fair contracts resolution; whether Messrs. Harrison and Sons, Grantham, have contracted to supply 500 baskets to the Post Office, and are paying the men 2s. 6d. instead of the trade standard sum of 3s. 9d., and are sub-letting some of the work; and, if so, what action he can take in the matter.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I am strict in enforcing the "fair wages" clause in all Post Office contracts. I am informed that there is no standard rate of 3s. 9d. in Grantham. If the hon. Member will furnish me with the evidence on which he bases his statement that 3s. 9d. is the current rate in the district, I will have further inquiry made. I am assured that none of the work is sublet.

Low Valley Roman Catholic School.

*MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education what is the reason that the Roman Catholic School at Low Valley is not now placed on the grant list, in view of the fact that there is a considerable deficiency of accommodation now admitted in the district; and, as it is obvious that this cannot be made good by the end of the summer holidays, can he see his way now to replace the school on the list.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): This is one of the matters which I propose to discuss with a deputation from the local education authority to-morrow, and I am not, therefore, in a position to make any statement on the subject to-day.

*MR. BOLAND: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that within the last two weeks, since the closing of the Anglican school, forty-one children have been unable to obtain education, and if the Roman Catholic school is to be closed, at least 160 children will not get education?

MR. MCKENNA: That is one of the questions I propose to discuss with the deputation to-morrow.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: But this House should be told before a deputation.

MR. MCKENNA: I am seeing the deputation in order to get at the facts. I shall approach the question with an open mind.

Merioneth School Teachers' Salaries.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the teachers in the voluntary schools in the county of Merioneth are not paid their salaries till after the summer holidays, while the teachers in the council schools are paid before the holidays; and, if so, what steps he is taking to remedy this hardships on the voluntary school teachers.

MR. MCKENNA: The Board have no information as to when school teachers' salaries in Merionethshire are paid.

Llandwrog School.

LORD R. CECIL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the requirements of His Majesty's inspector as to the supply of desks for the voluntary school at Llandwrog have been left unsatisfied by the local education authority for the county of Carnarvon for more than two years; and, if so, whether the Board will take steps to see that the requirements of their inspector are satisfied.

MR. MCKENNA: The Answer to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. I am in communication with the local authority on the question of the supply of desks, and I hope that there may be no further delay in this case.

Scottish Appeals.

MR. WATT: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he will, in order to cheapen and expedite litigation in Scotland, bring about the abolition of appeals from one judge to another single judge, and particularly from sheriff-substitute to sheriff-principal.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. THOMAS SHAW, Hawick Burghs): By the Sheriff Courts Bill now before the House the Government propose considerably to raise the limit of actions in which the sheriff-substitute's judgment is final, and otherwise to simplify and cheapen procedure. No further steps are at present in contemplation.

Crannagh Farm.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a labourer named Thomas Gaffney applied for a cottage and allotment of land in the Mountmellick rural district on a particular farm of land known as Crannagh; that the sites committee of the council subsequently altered Gaffney's representation and marked the site on a farm known as Clonian, far distant from his work, and took the representation of the labourer who had originally applied on the latter holding and changed it to the site which Gaffney had selected in the first instance; and will he inquire from the district council what is the explanation of this juggling with representations, and why Gaffney's cottage was not marked on the site selected by him.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The Local Government Board understand that the facts are as stated in the Question. The responsibility for selecting proper sites for labourers' cottages rests with the rural district councils. It is not the practice of the Local Government Board to interfere on behalf of individual applicants in such cases. The Board are not prepared to give any support to the view that the labourer himself should have the absolute selection of the site.

Irish Intermediate Education.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state whether arrangements have now been made for the placing on the Irish Estimates for next year of a small sum so as to enable a discussion to take place on the question of the Intermediate Education Vote for Ireland.

MR. BIRRELL: I have carefully inquired into this matter, and find that there would be considerable difficulty in the way of taking the exceptional course suggested in the Question. The funds administered by the Intermediate Education Board have been assigned to the Board by statute and are not voted by this House. Seeing that Parliament has thus placed the Board in an independent position in respect of funds, it does not appear to me that the object in view would be attained by placing on the Estimates a small sum for which the Board have not asked and which they probably do not want. The rules, however, which the Board annually make for carrying out the purposes entrusted to them are subject to the approval of the Lord-Lieutenant and are laid before Parliament in order that Parliament may disapprove of them if it should think fit. I cannot at present say what discussion of the Board's policy may be possible next session, but I should think that there will be no difficulty in finding a suitable opportunity, and on that point I will consult the Prime Minister when the time arrives.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the opportunity of discussion of rules which were laid on the Table of the House only arises after 11 o'clock, which is no real opportunity at all, and whether it was not a fact that the sum of £80,000 or £90,000 a year is voted without any opportunity whatever of discussing the amount; and further, whether there are not several precedents for putting down what is known to Parliament as a token vote upon the Estimates for the purpose of enabling matters of this kind to be discussed?

MR. BIRRELL: That sometimes is done, but it appears to me to be a clumsy mode of raising a question having regard to the fact that some £80,000 or £90,000 a year is voted. I will, however, consider the whole question. I agree it is of the utmost importance to have a discussion even after 11 o'clock.

Administration of the Labourers Act.

MR. SHEEHAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing that Article 13 of The Labourers (Ireland) Order, 1906, sets forth that the clerk of every rural district council shall forward to the Local Government Board a copy of every representation upon which the council have declined to take action, together with a statement of the council's reasons for so declining endorsed thereon, he will say why the Local Government Board framed this article unless they intended to take some executive or administrative action in cases where it could be shown to them, as a result of the inspector's investigations of repeated representations at the local inquiry, that cottages and allotments were refused to labourers on unjust or frivolous grounds; and, if the Local Government Board cannot make any addition to the lands proposed in an improvement scheme to be taken compulsorily, will he say whether the Board will order that representations improperly and illegally rejected should be included in a special supplementary scheme.

MR. BIRRELL: In framing the article referred to in the Question the Local Government Board were merely requiring that the provisions of Section 10 of the Labourers Act of 1883 should be carried out. The statutes do not give power to the Board to override the decision of the rural district council in individual cases. The inspector, however, may make representations to the council in regard to any case in which he thinks that an application has been rejected on insufficient grounds, and in such case the council might reconsider the matter when the next scheme should be under their consideration. There do not appear to be any grounds for supposing that the councils generally have unduly rejected applications; for I understand that the schemes which have already been made would involve an expenditure considerably in excess of the amount provided by the Act.

Irish Trade Statistics.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the important debate on the Irish Department of Agriculture which is to take place shortly, he will secure that the Report on Irish exports and imports is published before the debate takes place.

MR. BIRRELL: My hon. friend the Vice-President of the Department informs me that the Report and Tables of Irish exports and imports is in the printer's hands, and that, while the Department cannot promise that the Report will be ready by the 25th instant, every effort will be made to present it to Parliament before that date.

Evicted Tenants and Fair Rents.

MR. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will introduce legislation amending the Land Law (Ireland) Act of 1881, so as to give to tenants who have been evicted and subsequently restored as future tenants the right of applying to have fair rents fixed.

MR. BIRRELL: I can only repeat the Answer which I have given to previous similar Questions, namely, that I am not in a position to make any statement as to the possibility or desirability of extending to future tenants the fair rent provisions of the Land Acts.

Drainage of the Barrow.

MR. MEEHAN (Queen's County, Leix): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the report of the county surveyor for Queen's County, dated January, 1907, in which the attention of the district council is again drawn to the condition of the River Barrow at Tinnahinch, on the road from Mountmellick to Clonaslee, and stating that the Local Government Board and the Barrow Drainage Commission have had their attention drawn to the matter, and that, unless the river is sunk sufficiently below this point, very considerable damage to roads, walls, and bridges, through the action of the floods, may reasonably be anticipated in the near future; and whether, seeing that the county council have no authority under the Local Government Act to prevent the threatened destruction of the bridges and damage to public works, he will say what steps will be taken by which the threatened destruction of public works can be prevented.

I beg also to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a copy of the schedule of losses sustained by Mr. John Donohoe, of Fisherstown, Ballybrittas, caused by the floods from the River Barrow, covering a period from 1901 to 1905, and showing a loss in cattle drowned and injured, hay, corn, and root crops injured and destroyed, of a total money value of £429; can he say what relief, if any, will be provided for the occupiers in the flooded area; and what action, pending legislation, the Government intend to take to mitigate the evils admitted to exist, and which Sir Alexander Binnie's Commission declared it was impossible for local effort to cope with.

MR. BIRRELL: I have received from the hon. Member the report of the county surveyor referred to in his first Question, and the schedule of losses which Mr. Donohoe states he has sustained, referred to in the second Question. I regret that I am not in a position to add anything to the replies which I have given to the hon. Member's previous Questions on the general subject of the Barrow drainage. Legislation will be necessary before any large drainage schemes can be carried out, and, having regard to the large amount of money involved and to the intricacy of the subject generally, it is impossible to consider the question of legislation during the present session.

MR. MEEHAN asked whether in view of the fact that the last two months were exceedingly wet, producing constant floods, some temporary relief, at all events, might not be provided for the people of this district, or could nothing be done by the Government to help those people who had bought their farms and whose crops were destroyed, to enable them to pay their annuities and discharge their obligations.

MR. BIRRELL: The hon. Member knows, I am sure, that nothing would give me greater pleasure than to answer this Question in the affirmative. At the present moment I am not in a position to give a satisfactory reply.

Irish Local Government Auditors.

MR. MEEHAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what are the qualifications necessary for appointment as auditor under the Irish Local Government Board; are appointments made by nomination or as the result of competitive examination; what is the difference in the duties discharged by auditors of county accounts and auditors of district accounts; and how many of the sixteen auditors employed have passed a Civil Service examination.

MR. BIRRELL: Auditors are appointed by nomination, subject to their obtaining from the Civil Service Commissioners a certificate of proficiency in certain prescribed subjects, including a knowledge of accounts and of the Irish Poor Laws. The division of the staff into county and district auditors is a purely departmental arrangement in connection with the distribution of the work. The persons nominated undergo examination by the Civil Service Commissioners in all cases unless the Commissioners are otherwise satisfied that they possess the required knowledge. All of the present auditors obtained Civil Service Certificates, and fourteen of them after examination.

MR. KILBRIDE: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman is he prepared to lay upon the Table of the House, as a Parliamentary Paper, the subjects of examination to which an auditor is subjected?

MR. BIRRELL: I do not know about a Parliamentary Paper, but I shall be glad to give that information to the hon. Member, and will look into the matter.

MR. MEEHAN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the gentlemen appointed as auditors have had no previous experience?

MR. BIRRELL: The knowledge of accounts is one of the subjects in which they are examined.

Irish Prison Warders Salaries.

MR. MEEHAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland can he say what is the salary of prison warders in Ireland; whether the minimum and maximum salaries are considerably below the minimum and maximum salaries paid to prison warders in England of the same rank and who discharge the same duties as warders in the Irish prisons service; can he say what are the minimum and maximum salaries paid to clerks and storekeepers in the Irish prisons service; whether the salaries of those officers are considerably below the minimum and maximum salaries paid to officers of the same rank and standing in the English prisons service and discharging the same duties; and can he say on what grounds Irish prison officials of the same standing and discharging equally important duties are denied equality with their brother officers in England.

MR. BIRRELL: The hon. Member will find full information as to the scales of salary of prison officers in England and Ireland in the published Estimates for the current year. It is the fact that the scales of salary in Irish prisons are somewhat below the corresponding scales of salary in England; but I understand that the principle has never been admitted that the emoluments of Irish prison officers should necessarily be equal in every respect to those of English prison officers. The rates of pay of the officers referred to in the Question are, however, at present under review.

Land Commission's Assistant Clerkships.

MR. MEEHAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware if Mr. W. H. Wilkinson was appointed assistant clerk to the Land Commission in 1905, at the salary of £300 a year, on the recommendation of a firm of land agents, excluding a number of the permanent staff who were qualified for the position; whether he is aware that, during the months of May and June, 1907, Mr. Wilkinson accepted service of writs and other documents in connection with the Kirkpatrick estate; can he say whether it was as land agent or in what capacity Mr. Wilkinson accepted service of those documents; whether Mr. Wilkinson still continues to act as land agent or clerk in a land agent's office; and if he is now on the permanent staff of the Land Commission Office and bound to give his entire time to the duties of his office.

MR. BIRRELL: I find that on 3rd May, 1906,† my predecessor fully informed the hon. Member of the circumstances of Mr. Wilkinson's appointment. The Land Commission inform me that it is not the case that Mr. Wilkinson accepted service of writs as stated in the Question, or that he acts as land agent or clerk to a land agent. On the contrary, his time is wholly devoted to the Commissioners' service.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clvi., 701.

MR. MEEHAN: Will the right hon. Gentleman inform us whether any legal documents have been lodged in the offices in Dublin, of which Mr. Wilkinson has accepted service in connection with this estate?

MR. BIRRELL: Full inquiry has been made in that matter, and on previous occasions I answered the Question that one of the tenants served legal notice on Mr. Wilkinson in mistake for his brother.

MR. KILBRIDE: What qualifying examination did Mr. Wilkinson pass?

MR. BIRRELL: As a matter of fact Mr. Wilkinson was examined by two persons each without knowing the other had examined him, and both placed him easily first.

Tandragee Evicted Tenant.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the name of Samuel Rainey, of Ballymore, Tandragee, county Armagh, is included in the Estates Commissioners' list of persons who are suitable for and should be provided with holdings under the Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill.

I beg also to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, in reference to the application of Samuel Rainey for reinstatement on his former holding at Tandragee, the person now in possession of the farm is willing to surrender it to the Estates Commissioners at the price which he gave for the holding at public auction; whether the Estates Commissioners are aware of that fact; and whether the terms asked are considerably below the selling value of land in the locality.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners are prepared to consider Samuel Rainey's application in connection with the allotment of any untenanted land which they may acquire, but they would prefer to facilitate his restoration to his former holding if the present occupier should be willing to accept reasonable terms. The amount which the present occupier has demanded is, in the Commissioners' opinion, extravagant, and according to their information it is largely in excess of the amount which he paid for the holding.

MR. LONSDALE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that he is prepared to sell the land at the price which he paid for it?

*MR. BIRRELL: I will inquire into that. My information was to the contrary.

Irish Department of Agriculture—Committee of Inquiry.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what are the reasons for the delay in the issue of the minutes of evidence taken by the Committee of Inquiry into the working of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction in Ireland; and whether he will arrange for the publication of the same without further delay.

MR. BIRRELL: The publication of the evidence taken by the Committee referred to is not a matter for which I am responsible. I have, however, ascertained from His Majesty's Stationery Office that the evidence has been in the printer's hands for some time and will be ready for distribution about the 26th instant. The volume is a large one containing over a thousand pages.

Cattle Driving in the West of Ireland.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has bean called to the remarks of Mr. Justice Wright, at the Roscommon Assizes on Friday, that cattle driving was absolutely lawless and entirely subversive of the rights of property, that the movement had spread through many of the counties in the West of Ireland and had attained a strength which was a formidable menace to the public peace, and if it was not grappled with vigorously it would land that part of the country in a state of anarchy; and whether he will state when the Executive intend to grapple vigorously with this movement.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Before the right hon. Gentleman answers this Question, may I ask him not to attach too much importance to the remarks of Mr. Justice Wright, as the right hon. Gentleman will recollect that Mr. Wright's utterances were extra-judicial, founded on no evidence, and that the Judge was for twenty years Crown Prosecutor and Chief Agent to the Government in carrying out the Coercion Act.

Mr. BIRRELL: It is impossible for me to assign to anyone the precise amount of weight that should be given to his remarks. My attention has been called to a newspaper report of Mr. Justice Wright's remarks. I have repeatedly stated that the Government have taken, and will continue to take, all possible measures for the preservation of the peace and for the prosecution of offenders.

Mr. KILBRIDE: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether cattle raising and shifting was not at one time an honourable occupation in Scotland?

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): Is the right hon. Gentleman able to say that cases of cattle driving in the West of Ireland are diminishing in numbers?

Mr. BIRRELL: I am rather disposed to think at the present moment that some improvement is noticeable even in those districts.

Irish Teachers' Salaries.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the nature of the special reports which the inspector is requested to furnish to the National Board of Education before a teacher is awarded an increase of salary or granted promotion; and whether any reasons can be assigned for the delay, running into months, in awarding increments and promotions to deserving teachers who have fulfilled all the necessary conditions imposed upon them by the Board?

Mr. BIRRELL: The Commissioners of National Education inform me that their inspectors are not required to make special reports before teachers are promoted or awarded increments of salary. As a rule promotions and the award of increments depend on the ordinary reports of the annual inspection of the school. The Commissioners are not aware that there has been any such delay as is referred to in the Question. If any particular case of delay should be brought to their notice they would have the matter investigated.

Irish School Inspections.

Mr. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that when a manager of a national school objects to a minute or report of an inspector, alleging that it is unjust and prejudicial to the interests of the school and teachers concerned, and asks for a reinspection, the Board consults the inspector implicated, and on his statement they decide whether a reinspection will be granted or not; and whether, in view of the possible injustice in such cases to some schools and teachers, a reinspection will be granted when asked for by a school manager without reference to the inspector to whose report the manager has taken exception.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Commissioners inform me that the action which they may take in such cases as are referred to in the Question is not determined by the statement of the inspector against whose report an appeal is made, but depends upon what the Commissioners consider to be the merits of the case. The Commissioners cannot undertake to order the reinspection of a school without reference to the inspector whose report is impugned.

Rules of the Irish Commissioners of National Education.

Mr. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that inconvenience is being caused to managers and teachers of national schools with respect to their arrangements for the new school year by the delay in the issue of the rules of Commissioners of National Education; and can he state when these rules will be issued.

MR. BIRRELL: The Commissioners of National Education inform me that their new code of rules is passing through the press and will be issued as soon as possible.

Agrarian Trials at Roscommon Assizes.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL (Dublin University): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland at what dates did the facts contained in the affidavit of County Inspector O'Connell, upon which the Solicitor-General for Ireland applied for and obtained on Friday last from the Judge of Assize in Roscommon an order for the postponement to the next assizes of the cases of agrarian crime returned for trial to that assize, first come to the knowledge of the police and the Executive; and can he state why no application for a change of venue was made in sufficient time to enable these cases to be investigated in some other venue at the present assizes, seeing that the result of the failure to apply at an earlier date is that none of these cases can now be investigated before December next, while in the meantime, as stated by the Judge of Assize, lawlessness is rampant in the county.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange): The general facts were for some time in the possession of the police and the Executive. It is not possible to indicate the precise dates. It was after a full investigation of the facts by my hon. friend the Solicitor-General, on the spot, that the conclusion was formed to apply for an adjournment of the trial with a view to moving for a change of venue. The application was made at the first possible opportunity. Under the law no such application can be made until after the indictment has been found by the Grand Jury. The right hon. Gentleman is in error in supposing that these cases necessarily cannot be investigated before December, and steps are being taken to secure that the trial should be had at the earliest possible date.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL: Do I understand that it is proposed now to have the cases transferred to another venue so as to enable them to be disposed of at assizes?

MR. CHERRY: It is proposed to apply at the earliest possible date for a writ of *certiorari* and then for a change of the venue. I cannot say where such venue will be established.

Mr. Ginnell, M.P., and the Grass Farm Agitation.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the hon. Member for North Westmeath, in the course of a speech delivered by him on Sunday last at Killielagh, county Westmeath, advised his audience to obtain possession of the grass farms by driving the cattle off them, and said that they had it on the authority of Lord Denman that scattering cattle was no crime if they were not houghed; and what steps he intends to take in the matter.

MR. BIRRELL: I have seen a newspaper report of the speech referred to in the Question, but no sufficient evidence is forthcoming that the language attributed to the speaker was actually used. I am informed that the meeting referred to was a small impromptu meeting of no importance.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: Arising out of that Answer, will the right hon. Gentleman place the report which he refers to before the Law Officers of the Crown and get their opinion as to whether proceedings should be taken against the hon. Member?

MR. BIRRELL: The right hon. Gentleman the Attorney-General informs me that he has already read, in the course of his ordinary pursuits, the newspaper report.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: Then will the right hon. Gentleman inform me whether proceedings——

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must give notice of that Question.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I submit that in a serious question of this kind the steps to be taken by the Crown arises directly out of the Question.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The more serious the Question the more important it is that the hon. Member should give notice of it.

Mr. MOORE: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman the Attorney-General whether he will call for an official report? ["Cries of Order! order!"]

* Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must put down notice of that Question.

Destructive Insects and Pests Act.

Mr. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) can he state what steps will be now taken, under the powers conferred by the recently enacted Destructive Insects and Pests Act, to stamp out the disease of foul brood by which the success of the bee-keeping industry of Ireland is menaced.

Mr. CHERRY (for Mr. T. W. Russell): The Destructive Insects and Pests Act deals only with "any insect, fungus or other pests destructive to agriculture or horticulture crops or to trees or bushes," and so does not include foul brood, which is a contagious disease in bees.

King's County Assize Trials—Press Comments.

Mr. HAVILAND BURKE (King's County, Tullamore): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland, whether his attention has been called to the action of a newspaper published in London, entitled the *Pall Mall Gazette*, in making comments on the 2nd instant assuming the guilt of the defendants in a case *sub judice*, namely, that of the King v. Dooley and others, returned for trial at the next King's County assizes; whether he is aware that such comments were copied into a newspaper entitled the *Evening Mail*, published in Dublin on the 3rd instant; and what steps he proposes to take with reference to the persons responsible for this attempt to prejudice the administration of justice.

Mr. CHERRY: In the case referred to in the Question there were two counts contained in the indictment. The jury acquitted on the first charge and disagreed as to the second. The comments of the *Pall Mall Gazette* to which my attention has been called refer only, so far as I can judge, to the first charge which is not *sub judice*, having been decided by the verdict of the jury, and I do not think, therefore, that any action on my part is called for.

Swine Fever in Ireland.

Mr. BOLAND: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he is aware that the outbreaks of swine fever in Ireland in 1894 are recorded as being 7,619, but that in 1905 the number had been reduced to 48; that in Great Britain the figures for these years were respectively 5,682 and 817; and whether, in view of the far greater success that has attended the efforts in Ireland to eradicate this disease, that only one case of swine fever is alleged to have been imported from Ireland to Great Britain during the last three years, and that it is not alleged that this importation caused the increase of swine fever in Great Britain to 1,280 in 1906, and to 1,204 for the first twenty-four weeks of 1907, he will take steps to secure the repeal of the orders which ununduly restrict the importation of Irish pigs into Great Britain.

The TREASURER of the HOUSEHOLD (Sir Edward Strachey, Somersetshire, S.): The statistics given by the hon. Member in the Question are substantially correct, but the fact that only one case of swine fever has been discovered in pigs imported from Ireland since the imposition of the restrictions seems to the Board to be a testimony to their success rather than an argument for their removal. The Orders in question do not do more than provide similar safeguards, when pigs are brought from Ireland to Great Britain, to those provided when pigs are moved from district to district in Great Britain, and until Ireland is free from swine fever we should not be justified in allowing unrestricted importation from that country.

Mr. BOLAND: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether his attention has been called to the report of the chief veterinary inspector of the Board for 1906, in which he states that the common methods of post-mortem examination in cases of alleged swine fever are faulty, and that it is not by any means always an easy matter to diagnose swine fever by an ordinary post-mortem examination; and whether, in view of the fact that only an ordinary examination was made in the one case of swine fever alleged to have been imported from Ireland during the last three years, he will secure the repeal of the Orders restricting importation.

SIR. EDWARD STRACHEY: It is the case that the chief veterinary officer of the Board commented in his last annual report on the difficulty of diagnosing swine fever, but his remarks are directed to show that the disease may escape detection under the common methods of examination. In the particular case referred to the disease was diagnosed both by the local veterinary inspector and the veterinary officers of the Board, who reported that the lesions were typical of swine fever.

Irish Butter—Delivery Delays.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to a case where five boxes of butter consigned from Limerick, and handed in to the Great Southern and Western Railway Company on the 5th instant, for H. Blaxland, Station Road, Chingford, 10½ miles from London, were not delivered up to midday on the 11th instant; and, if so, will he cause inquiries to be made as to the delay; is he aware that such delays are constantly occurring, and that, if something is not done to stop it, this important Irish industry will be seriously injured.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): I have had my attention called to this matter by a forcible letter addressed to the hon. Member by the complainant, in which he is desired to "tell the Chairman of the Board of Trade that his life is in danger unless he brings these highway robbers to book somehow." In these circumstances I need hardly add that I am causing inquiries to be made and will let the hon. Member know the result.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C: Sir Howard Vincent; and had appointed in substitution: Captain Hervey.

Report to lie upon the Table.

MERCHANT SHIPPING (TONNAGE DEDUCTION FOR PROPELLING POWER) BILL.

Reported with Amendments, from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence.

Special Report brought up, and read.

Report and Special Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 256.]

Bill, as amended, re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 281.]

NEW BILL.

WASTE LANDS (IRELAND) IMPROVEMENT.

DR. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.) said the object of the Bill he begged leave to introduce was to enable county councils to acquire, under compulsory purchase powers, waste land for the purpose of improving it and letting or selling it as agricultural land to young men who would otherwise emigrate from the country. It gave power to the county council if it considered there was any waste land in the county to acquire it under compulsory powers for agricultural purposes, and to adapt it for occupation by dividing it, fencing it, providing water supply, etc. The council might also erect such buildings as might be necessary on the land or adapt existing buildings for occupation. Furthermore, the county council should not be required to give more than 5s. an acre for these waste lands, and should be empowered to borrow money for the purpose. There were at least a million acres of waste land in Connaught, and thousands of men, women and children had been forced to emigrate from that province in order to live. He thought that if the county councils were allowed to reclaim such land and make it fit for occupation in the way suggested by his Bill it would enable these people, who now had to go elsewhere, to get remunerative employment at home, and it would be for the general benefit of the community at large. By such an Act, land of this kind in Ireland might easily be transformed and used for useful agricultural purposes. He had originally inserted a money clause in the measure, but after further consideration he decided to leave the matter to the bounty of the Government. The Government were prepared to devote millions of money to new land schemes in the three countries, and were also going forward with an old-age pension scheme; therefore, having regard to the objects of his Bill, he did not think it was expecting too much of the Treasury when he asked them to finance it. He begged to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to enable county councils in Ireland to acquire and improve and sell or let waste land; and for other purposes."—(*Dr. Ambrose.*)

Mr. MOORE (Armagh, N.) said the measure should not be allowed to go through without a word of protest. They were greatly opposed to the idea that the county councils in Connaught—for he understood that the Bill was for the purpose of remedying the state of affairs in that province—should have compulsory powers to buy out any land they chose to call waste land at a maximum rate of 5s. an acre. It opened up a dangerous avenue for confiscation. Whilst letting the Bill pass that day without a division he could assure the House it would meet with opposition at a later stage.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Dr. Ambrose, Mr. Gwynn, Mr. William Redmond, Mr. Meagher, Mr. Lundon, Mr. MacNeill, Mr. Crean, Mr. John Roche, Mr. Duffy, Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. O'Malley, and Mr. M'Hugh.

WASTE LANDS (IRELAND) IMPROVEMENT BILL.

"To enable county councils in Ireland to acquire and improve and sell or let waste land; and for other purposes," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 282.]

Dr. Ambrose.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee)

[Mr. Emmott (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Mr. MOORE said that in order to enable the Chief Secretary to make a statement, and so facilitate discussion upon the various Amendments, he wished formally to move to report progress. The Bill obtained a First and Second Reading on the foundation and basis of the Estates Commissioners' Report. That Report contained limitations in three important respects. When, however, they came to look at the Bill they found that none of those limitations were contained in it. He wished to ask the Chief Secretary whether he was prepared to embody those limitations in the Bill. The Commissioners found that there were 2,000 evicted tenants for whom holdings would have to be found, but under the Bill it would be open to the Commissioners to provide holdings for 10,000. Would the right hon. Gentleman assent to put a limitation in the Bill agreeing with the finding of the Report in that respect? Then the Report found that the maximum amount of land required would be 80,000 acres. Would the right hon. Gentleman put a limitation in the Bill limiting the powers of the Commissioners to the acquisition of 80,000 acres? As the Bill stood it would be open to the Commissioners to acquire compulsorily the whole of the soil of Ireland. The third point he wished to deal with was the question of the tenancy of the land. The findings of the Estates Commissioners' Report did not suggest for a moment that there was any necessity to acquire tenanted land; they based their whole case upon the compulsory acquisition of untenanted land. It had been agreed on all sides that people who were known technically as "planters" should not be disturbed. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give an assurance that the Bill would be limited in the directions he had indicated; that he would say whether he intended to thrust everything, fair or unfair, down their throats, or whether he was willing to arrive at a satisfactory and reasonable solution. He suggested that the right hon. Gentleman should apprise them of the real situation at the earliest possible moment, so that they might know exactly where they stood in the matter. He begged to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Moore.*)

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.) said he could assure the hon. and learned Gentleman that he had no desire to thrust anything down anyone's throat. He was particularly anxious to facilitate the discussion and progress of this measure, but he was unable to give the hon. and learned Gentleman the assurances for which he asked. He could not admit that the First and Second Readings of the Bill were obtained on the statement that it was based on the Report of the Estates Commissioners. That Report was invited in order that the Government might get some idea of the magnitude of the problem. The Commissioners conceived that 2,000 would probably be about the maximum number of people who would satisfy their requirements, and to say that the Bill was brought in simply to give effect to the finding of the Court was contradicted by the fact that it dealt with subjects to which the Commissioners made no reference at all. It was impossible for him—nor would it be right—to consent to Amendments which would limit the number of evicted tenants to 2,000 or the acreage to be acquired to 80,000. Nevertheless, they had before them the Report of the Commissioners that 2,000 tenants would be about the figure and that about forty acres would be required in a number of cases to enable the tenants to live and thrive, but that was in no way a binding estimate upon them or upon the House. The Bill proposed to vest in the Commissioners a discretion, but not to exclude the possibility of the restoration of tenants to the actual holdings from which they were evicted. If the House tied their hands in that way they would declare their inability to deal with the question in the way they desired.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) said he was not surprised that the hon. Member for North Armagh should have made the request he had. Although he did not suggest that there was a distinct understanding or that the Government based their whole Bill on the number of evicted tenants and the amount of land mentioned in the report, it was presented as a very strong argument in defence of the Bill, if it did not amount to a justification, that the number of tenants would be approximately 2,000, and that the amount of land required would be that suggested. They now had a further statement—practically that the result of the Bill would be to place in the hands of the Estates Commissioners an unlimited power to deal with evicted tenants on such terms, within the limitations of the Bill, as they thought right. That materially altered the condition of affairs, because many of them believed that it would be found impossible to confine the number to anything like 2,000. When these first 2,000 became recipients of the Government bounty, there would be many others crowding in to claim the same rights. It was quite evident from the right hon. Gentleman's speech that it was not intended to place any limitation upon the action of the Government. They must treat the Bill as one which had not a limited bearing on the question, but as one which opened up a completely new field of compulsory land purchase, subject to the will and discretion of the Estates Commissioners.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL (Dublin University) said he desired to call attention to the actual words used by the Chief Secretary in the course of his speech on the Second Reading of the Bill. When he reminded the right hon. Gentleman of the words he used, he would see that he had quite unintentionally misconceived his own position, and had unintentionally deceived the House when he said that he did not say that the scope of this Bill would be found in the limit of 2,000 cases. The right hon. Gentleman's language was perfectly clear and unambiguous.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The question before the House is to report Progress. It is not relevant to discuss the merits of the Chief Secretary's reply on that Motion.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL thought he would be able to show that the observations he was about to make were perfectly germane to the subject-matter of the Motion. They wished to know whether the Chief Secretary could give an assurance that some of the limitations which he and his friends proposed to insert in the Bill would be in accordance with the wish of the Government. The right hon. Gentleman informed the House on the occasion of the Second Reading that the problem was how to set about the restoration to their old holdings, not of an unknown and uncertain number of evicted tenants, but of those 2,000 persons—assuming that to be the correct figure—whose cases had been or would be investigated. Whatever ambiguity there might be in that statement the right hon. Gentleman disposed of immediately afterwards when he said—

> "We have to appreciate what the limited purposes of the Bill are. They are the reinstatement of those 2,000 scheduled or named persons compulsorily."

He ventured to say that a more specific and emphatic declaration could not be conceived as coming from the lips of a member of the Government in the position of the right hon. Gentleman.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I must stop the right hon. Gentleman. He is arguing the merits of the matters about which questions were put to the Chief Secretary. That is not in order on the Motion to report Progress.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 46; Noes, 247. (Division List No. 288.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood,RtHn.Sir Alex.F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J.(City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bull, Sir William James
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish, Rt.Hon.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim, S.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,Robert (Lanark,Govan
Gretton, John
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hill, Sir Clement(Shrewsbury)
Hill, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hon.Col.W.
Long,Rt. Hn. Walter(Dublin,S.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Parkes, Ebenezer
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sheffield,SirBerkeleyGeorge D.
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Thomson, W. Mitchell (Lanark
Valentia, Viscount
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Moore and Mr. Lonsdale.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker,Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Baring,Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barry,Redmond J. (Tyrone,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Bright, J. A.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L. (Lancs.,Leigh)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar,Sir J.A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson,W.H. (St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber G. H. (Boston)

Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Flynn, James Christopher
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt.Hn.SirW.Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hart-Davies, T.
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,Sir JosephF. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David

Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Partick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncaster
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
O'Brien,Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington,Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central
Price,Robert John(Norfolk, E.
Priestley,W.E.B. (Bradford,E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n

Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Rt.Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Schwann, Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Seddon, J.
Shaw,Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley,Hn. A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James(Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas,Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, SirA. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E. (Clackmannn
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wison, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Whiteley and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

*MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) moved to omit Sub-section (1) of Clause 1. He said the sub-section contained a principle to which he objected very much. It embodied what was, after all, the pith, marrow, and backbone of the Bill. The Estates Commissioners were to be empowered by the sub-section to obtain land compulsorily not only from the landlord, who in this House, as at present constituted, was likely, he was afraid, to receive very little sympathy, but also to obtain it by dispossessing forcibly and against his will a law-abiding, rent-paying, and respectable citizen who had worked on his farm perhaps for twenty-five years, and might even have been born upon it. Before he gave his reasons for objecting to this compulsion he would like to read to the House three short extracts from speeches of hon. Members who now supported the Bill, one of whom, at any rate, in the past took a very different view. If they turned back to the debates on the Evicted Tenants Bill in 1894, they would see that the hon. Gentleman who now held the responsible position of Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture in Ireland used some very strong and forcible language with reference to compulsion, though he was backing the present Bill. On 23rd July, 1894, he said he would have denied to the Board of Arbitration a single atom of compulsory power. That was his view in 1894, with reference to compulsion generally. What was his view of compulsion as applied to the landlord to put back upon his estate an evicted tenant? He said he thought it would be a very hard and severe thing to say to a landlord who had ejected a tenant, perhaps years before, for non-payment of rent, that he must give up the land he was farming at a profit and take back the man who had conspired to defraud him. Yet the hon. Gentleman was backing the present Bill! It was, the hon. Gentleman then said, not only a hard but a dangerous thing to say. He cordially agreed with the sentiment uttered by the hon. Member in those days. It was indeed a hard and dangerous thing that was going to be said to the landlords in the Bill. Then, to come to a nearer date, what did the hon. and learned Member for Waterford say in 1903? On 29th June of that year he said that there was no intention of putting into the Bill any provision by which pressure, direct or indirect, could be brought to bear upon existing tenants. What had happened during the three and a half years which had elapsed since then to cause the hon. Member to change his view? He could only imagine that the compulsory provision was put in the Bill in order that the Government might obtain the land at less than its market value. That was obvious if they looked at the provisions which would enable them to obtain the land and if they remembered who was to obtain it. He objected mainly on two grounds to the principle of compulsion. In the first place he objected because there was an undoubted agreement in 1903 on all sides of the House that there should be no compulsion put upon the landlord to put back the evicted tenants. The House agreed that facilities should be given to put them back, and that the Commissioners should be given power to purchase land; but there was a general agreement on the part of the landlords, of hon. Gentlemen below the gangway, and of hon. Members on that side of the House that the Bill should be put through on the understanding that no compulsion should be applied. Yet they saw in three and a half years a Bill brought in to tear up that consideration and to put the landlord in a worse position than he was in in 1903. He also objected because in the past compulsion had never been applied to an owner of land unless it could be shown that it was to the good of the general public that the land should be compulsorily taken from him. Railway and canal companies were only empowered to take land compulsorily because Parliament considered it right that the public should not be hindered by a landowner who wilfully refused to sell his land. Compulsion was also right for the public good under the Housing of the Working Classes Act in the case of a landlord who refused to sell his land where there was an insanitary area. He offended against the public health, and in that case Parliament had very properly sanctioned compulsion. In this Bill they were asked to give very wide compulsory powers, not for the benefit of the general public in Ireland, but for the heads of 2,000 families at most. That was a very great step in advance. They might argue with considerable weight that compulsory powers in the case of the Labourers Act of last year were necessary for the prosperity of Ireland, because agricultural work could not be carried on if labourers cottages were not built; but in this case it was a very limited number of persons for whose benefit they were going to spend money to expropriate landowners whom it was not suggested were using their land improperly. The Government said there were 2,000 evicted tenants whom it was necessary to put back on the land, and that they could not do it without compulsion. The hon. Member for East Mayo, however, not long ago said that the evicted tenants amounted to 800 in all, and that in a very short time they would be reduced to 400. It was strange that they should have suddenly sprung up to 2,000. He understood that up to May this year there had been some 8,400 applications from evicted tenants claiming to be reinstated: 1,000 had already been put back, 1,600 more applications had been passed as valid, and 400 more the right hon. Gentleman said he imagined would be passed. Therefore, 5,400 would be put aside as not coming within the rules and regulations laid down by the Estates Commissioners. When the Government asked for compulsory powers, they ought to see how much progress had been made in the last three and a half years under the voluntary system. The limited number to be reinstated was 3,000, and of these 1,000, or 33⅓ per cent., had been reinstated in three and a half years. Surely it was a strong measure to come before the House and say they must have compulsory powers to put back 2,000 tenants, when already in three and a half years 1,000 had been reinstated under the voluntary system. He ventured to think the progress made in reinstating the evicted tenants was far greater than in the sale and purchase of estates, which after all was the prime reason for the Act of 1903. By the Bill they would be putting the good tenants in a worse position than the evicted tenants.

MR. R. L. EVERETT (Suffolk, Woodbridge) asked if it was in order to make a Second Reading speech in Committee. It had been decided by a vast majority that there should be compulsion behind the measure, and he respectfully submitted it as not in order to re-discuss it.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that he could not rule that the first five lines of the Bill contained the whole principle of the Second Reading, but he must point out that if the Amendment were divided upon, he could not allow another discussion on the question of compulsion.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said he would like to point out that the first five lines contained other matters besides compulsion. It embraced the very important question of dealing with land whether tenanted or untenanted. Surely it would be quite in order for any hon. Member, if the Amendment to strike the subsection out were rejected, to move another Amendment dealing with either of the two propositions contained in it. The Committee might disagree with the insertion of the word land, as distinguished from untenanted land, or it might disagree with the insertion of the word "compulsory."

*THE CHAIRMAN said he had to have regard not only to the actual Amendment, but also to the way in which it was advocated by the hon. Member who moved it. Up to the present the whole speech of the hon. Member had been practically limited to the question of compulsion, and under those circumstances he certainly could not allow another discussion on the word "compulsorily." The principle of their debates was that they could not discuss and decide the same question twice, and it would be an abuse of that principle if they debated the question of compulsion on the proposal to leave out the sub-section, and then again on an Amendment to leave out the word "compulsorily." The reason he mentioned the matter was to warn the Committee, so that they should know what they were discussing.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S. asked whether, seeing that the backbone of the Bill was contained in this section, which conferred compulsory powers, in supporting the Amendment of his hon. friend they would later on be precluded from discussing the question of "tenanted" and "untenanted" land.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that that would depend upon the character of the speeches on the Amendment. He should not desire to shut out a further discussion on "tenanted" or "untenanted" land, but it was quite impossible to have a discussion on the same proposition twice over.

MR. MOORE inquired whether he was right in thinking that in dealing with the question of compulsion they were all to speak on this Amendment, and whether the same thing was true in regard to untenanted land.

*THE CHAIRMAN said he had not given any ruling as to the question of "untenanted" land. The question must depend upon the character of the speeches on the Amendment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) quite understood the object with which the Chairman had laid down the rule to prevent the unnecessary discussion of the same topic twice over. Of course, however, when they came to discuss the question that the whole clause should stand part of the Bill they would have an opportunity of reviewing it. That was a necessary part of their discussion. They were now discussing a clause which had two main topics. One was whether there should be compulsion, and the other was whether it should apply to land "tenanted" and "untenanted," or whether it was to be limited to land "untenanted." They were two very important topics, and he would like to know how they were to discuss them. Of course they would be glad to follow the rulings of the Chairman.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that if the right hon. Gentleman asked his advice he thought the most convenient course would be for the omission of the sub-section not to be moved, but that they should take the discussion on the two points separately on the later Amendments.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said it was desirable to know where they were. If his hon. friend made his speech on the omission of the sub-section, after he had concluded his remarks were they to be precluded from discussing the omission of the word "compulsory"?

*THE CHAIRMAN said the only difficulty was that the matter did not lie in his hands, because upon objection he must act in accordance with the rules of the House. The hon. Member had not yet moved the omission of the sub section, and after considering the matter he need not proceed unless he wished.

MR. ASHLEY said that under the circumstances he would not move the Amendment.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL moved an Amendment having for its object the restriction of the power of compulsory purchase to "untenanted land." The question involved in the Amendment was, he said, one of the most important that could be raised at the Committee stage, and it had assumed a magnitude out of all proportion to what was anticipated, having regard to the introductory words of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, because so long as it was in contemplation that the Bill was limited in its scope there might be less objection to the inclusion of land whether "tenanted" or "untenanted." But the whole position had been changed and the whole scope of the Bill altered by the interpretation which the right hon. Gentleman put upon it that day. The Bill had assumed a much wider scope and would have much more far-reaching results than was originally contemplated. The right hon. Gentleman originally stated that the number of evicted tenants under the Bill would be 2,000, but now it appeared that he was not prepared to fetter the discretion of the Estates Commissioners or to insert anything in the Bill which would bind them to any such limit. In his speech upon the Second Reading the right hon. Gentleman was most concise, and said the Bill was introduced to effect the reinstatement of 2,000 named and scheduled persons. Now, however, it appeared that it might apply to 8,500 tenants, and not to 2,000 people whose cases had been earmarked. The Bill referred to all those who had applied to the Estates Commissioners for reinstatement, and the number of those being 8,500 that was the only limit of the measure.

MR. CLOUGH (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton) inquired as a point of order what the question of 2,000 or 8,500 tenants had to do with the question of "untenanted land."

*THE CHAIRMAN said he was waiting for the right hon. Gentleman to make his point clear in regard to the matter. He thought it was relevant.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said that what he was going to show was that they were giving the Estates Commissioners power to purchase land which was either "tenanted" or "untenanted" and they must in discussing the question have regard to the scope of the Bill. It was said to be confined to a definite number of people, viz., 2,000, and now they found it applied to 8,500 persons. With regard to the distinction between tenanted and untenanted land he did not propose to go back on the arrangement come to in 1903. It was then said that whatever might be done for the evicted tenants under the Bill of 1903 nothing was to be done with regard to the tenanted lands in that respect. The express object of the Amendment was to carry out the honourable and distinct arrangement come to in 1903. If the word "untenanted" were inserted then the Estates Commissioners could not under the Bill purchase by compulsion any land at present in the hands of a tenant. He agreed with what had been said as to the so-called "planters"; that there were some who had no reluctance whatever to give up their land. If that were so, where was the necessity for compulsion? He had never heard of any instances where the landlords refused to allow them, except in the case of two estates out of 114. If the real object of the Bill was to bring pressure to bear on Lord Clanricarde let it be openly stated and let them not go about it in this cowardly way. He could hardly conceive that that was the object, because he could not imagine the Government would have gone through the farce of introducing a Bill of that kind for the purpose of dealing with one or two estates. It might be true there were certain men who were not planters in the ordinary sense to whose interest it might be to give up their holdings and who desired that power should be given to compel their landlords to allow them to surrender their farms. But that was not the scope and extent of the Bill. If it had been framed for such a purpose, all he could say was that it was a monstrous thing that the House of Commons should be asked to listen to a proposition or suggestion that those who had held their lands for twenty-five years, who had put their capital into it, whose sons and daughters had put their labour into it, who had ploughed and tilled it for all that time, should be compelled against their will to surrender their holdings. Lord Crewe had stated recently in another place that it was not the purpose of the Government to interfere with those "planters" who used their holdings as an ordinary farmers. Was that the intention of the Government or not? If it was, would the right hon. Gentleman explain that explicit statement of Lord Crewe? But under the Bill as it stood, even men who had been farming their holdings for twenty-five years could be turned out. He, therefore, trusted that the Committee would accept that Amendment, which was designed to confine the operation of the Bill to untenanted land. If the right hon. Gentleman told the Committee that Lord Crewe had correctly stated the intention of the Government a great deal of his objection to the clause would be got rid of; but when two voices spoke on behalf of the Government giving two different interpretations of their intentions there was put upon the Opposition the necessity of seeing that the real objects of the Government were carried out. He moved the Amendment with great confidence, and appealed to the Government to assent to it, or if not, that the right hon. Gentleman would express his views and intentions upon the matter.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 6, after the word 'any,' to insert the word 'untenanted.'"—*(Mr. Campbell.)*

Question proposed, "That the word 'untenanted' be there inserted."

MR. BIRRELL said that, as was often the case when he followed the right hon. Gentleman, he had some difficulty in reconciling two parts of the right hon. Gentleman's speech. In the first place his Amendment sought to strike out tenanted land from the operation of the clause, which would for ever prevent the restoration of the evicted tenant. He wished to have it at all events quite clear that the powers of the Bill should not be restricted to untenanted land; but that the Estates Commissioners should also have power where tenanted land was concerned. This Amendment would put a complete obstacle in the way of the reinstatement of evicted tenants on their former holdings, except in cases where "planters" agreed to go out. The right hon. and learned Gentleman subsequently said that his objection would be largely removed in two ways. He did not object to the landlord being compelled to sell the land now occupied by the "planter" if the planter were willing to go; but he did object to compulsion where the tenant was concerned. He also said that part of his objections would be removed if he could obtain assurances that the Bill would not accomplish the removal of the occupier from a farm of which he had been in possession for many years and into which he had put his capital. The Government felt that it was absolutely necessary, if they were to achieve the results desired, that a measure of this kind should be as complete as possible, and should provide the machinery and the means for doing what was necessary. Whether the number of cases was large or small where it was desirable to obtain possession of the land now tenanted in order to restore it to the evicted tenants, those cases were of the utmost importance in the social aspect of the question. Those were the hardest cases and had excited perhaps the most feeling throughout Ireland. They had been the causes of discontent and disturbance, as anyone knew who had to do with the administration of Ireland. They imposed upon the county the necessity of maintaining a large force of police; and they created a general sense of dissatisfaction and lawlessness, which it was one of the objects of this Bill to remove. Having regard to the cost which this Bill would involve, a cost which he did not desire in any way to under-rate, he did not think they would be justified in calling upon the Treasury to make the sacrifice they certainly would have to make under the provisions of this Bill, unless they thought it was going to accomplish something rather more than the mere restoration of a tenant to so many acres of land. It was because they believed that social and political effects and consequences would follow that they had thought it right to impose upon the Treasury a burden of that character. Therefore, the Bill, in his judgment, would be incomplete if it did not contain those powers, if it did not enable the Estates Commissioners, or whoever the tribunal might be, in certain cases to acquire land of the description he had referred to, and to restore the evicted tenants, where they thought it desirable, to their former holdings. He, therefore, insisted upon it that if they gave effect to the Amendment of the right hon. and learned Gentleman they would curtail the beneficial operation of the measure, they would destroy its effect, and they would, he thought, render it very hard to justify the cost they were entailing upon the public of this country, who, as he had said before, were always willing, he thought most generously, to play their part in the reconciliation and pacification of Ireland, or any part of it. Therefore, they felt that on that part of the case they must adhere to the clause. There were cases in which he agreed it would be a monstrous thing to turn out a tenant against his will if he were able to show that he and his family had lived for a period of years in perfect accord with their neighbours, getting on just as well as anybody did with their neighbours in Ireland. He had inserted words in Subsection (3) which enabled the Estates Commissioners to take into regard all the circumstances of the case and the cost involved, and to consider whether it was desirable that such a person should be removed. But they must trust somebody in these matters, and they could not be expected to employ language which would properly designate the circumstances in which it would be right to exercise the very great powers contained in the Bill. The circumstances of the cases varied. Some were so clear that no Estates Commissioners or any other body of men would dream of exercising the proposed powers and turning out those tenants. The words of Subsection (3) imposed on the Commissioners, or whoever the tribunal might be, the obligation to see that they did not turn out people who were carrying on the work of their farm in such a way that there was no disturbance in the neighbourhood, no extra police or anything of that kind, and who were able to work the land properly and wisely. These were not the persons that it was contemplated to turn out under the provisions of the Bill. He had made careful inquiries about the planters in different parts of the country, and sometimes he had got admirable reports about them, as to their working of the farms, and as to the peace in which they lived with their neighbours. But he had also received reports of an entirely different character in a great number of cases. He did not know how they came to be brought to those farms; he was innocent in these matters; he had no part with regard to them; but there were people in that House who knew perfectly well how they came to be brought on to the land. It was his duty to ascertain how these planters had been doing their work, and he found from the reports of inspectors and others who had examined their farms that they were not really *bona fide* farmers at all. Although the landlord had sometimes gone to the expense of supplying them with much better farm buildings than the former tenants, they had not taken advantage of their opportunity, and the land under their care had remained in a bad state. While there were cases in which it would be unjust to remove compulsorily these new tenants, there were cases in which it could be done without anyone's conscience being in the least strained. They could not distinguish by schedule, or by any means except examination of the circumstances on the spot, which tenants ought to be removed and which ought not, and he, therefore, contended that they would be falling short in this duty if they did not take power, in dealing with these cases, to restore, where the Estates Commissioners, or whoever the tribunal might be, thought it just and right, the former tenant to his own home. To apply the word "confiscation" to any provisions of the Bill was really to use language without meaning. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh."] Hon. Gentlemen opposite had had very little experience of confiscation if they thought that this was a confiscatory measure, and they would never meet with any Act less likely to deprive anybody of his land without the full price thereof being paid.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said the right hon. Gentleman's speech was much better than his Bill; it was sound and statesmanlike, but it was nowhere reflected in the Bill itself. The right hon. Gentleman had begun by putting upon his right hon. and learned friend the assumption that he accepted the principle of compulsion so far as the landlord and untenanted land were concerned. Those were questions which remained open for discussion. For the purpose of this particular discussion they were in the main concerned with the position of the tenant now in occupation. What they wanted to know was whether it was proper to keep in the Bill these unqualified words giving absolute power to the Estate Commissioners to turn out every man who was described in the Bill as a new tenant and who had been very wrongly described as a "planter." [AN HON. MEMBER: "Grabber".] He preferred to use the more decent language of the Bill. The measure gave absolutely unlimited power to the Commissioners compulsorily to buy out everybody who was described in the Bill as a "new tenant" and to put in everybody who was either himself the former tenant, or the representative of some tenant who had been evicted. Let them consider how this would work out if there was not a limit to, or at all events a guide for, the use of the discretion given to the Estate Commissioners. The object of the Bill, the right hon. Gentleman had said, was to produce a feeling of quiet and content, to get rid of an old sore, to diminish or remove an ancient grievance, and at last to enable the Land Purchase Act of 1903 to be operative in the manner expected by its friends. He would take the case of the representative of an evicted tenant, who had, perhaps, never seen the holding from which his predecessor was evicted, who had had nothing whatever to do with its cultivation, who had no associations with it except the vague and traditional and personal memories connected with it; who perhaps was not born there, had never worked there, had no friends there, and had no associations with it except such as lay in the simple fact that he was the representative of a man who had been evicted twenty years before. In the case of such a man it was in the power of the Estates Commissioners to turn out a tenant who might have been in occupation for twenty years. He need not be, very likely was not, one of those who were merely farmers in name; he might be, probably was, as good a farmer as any in Ireland, anxious to do his duty by the land in keeping his engagements, a good cultivator of the soil, a man who was perhaps married in the district and had children who had grown up on the holding, who was connected with the holding by every tie of affection, and who, having brought it up to its present state of cultivation, looked forward to purchasing it under the Land Act. In this Bill, without restriction or limitation, and without a suggestion of guidance, they gave to the Estates Commission the power of turning out that tenant in favour of a man to whose condition he had already referred. Was this proposal going to carry out the fundamental objects of the Bill, namely, to bring peace and harmony to Ireland? The explicit language used by the Nationalist representatives in this House when the Bill of 1903 was under discussion had been quoted, to the effect that in regard to such men as he had described and new tenants of any kind no compulsion would be used at all. The right hon. Gentleman had departed from that original understanding and violated that pledge. He had torn up the original compact, and if he was going to insist upon that policy at least let him undertake to put words in the Bill which would indicate what Lord Crewe had certainly indicated as his view and what he was quite certain would be the view of the majority of this House if they heard the case put fairly and temperately as he had tried to put it. He was sure that the majority of those who supported the Government did not wish to be responsible for any such gross acts of injustice as he had described, and that they would welcome guiding words which would mitigate the injustice and make it clear that when the Commissioners had to choose between new tenants of the kind he had described and the evicted tenant they would see in the Act of Parliament plain directions and would not be left to interpret vague words, and that they would have regard to "all the circumstances of the case, of the holding and of the district."

MR. BIRRELL: That is the very thing the right hon. Gentleman has been describing.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he wanted to keep on the holding the class of men whose case he had just described and try to find some other liberal way of dealing with the evicted tenants. He felt sure that when they came to that point the right hon. Gentleman would either find words or accept words suggested to him which would have the mitigating effect he had described. On the bare Amendment as they had it before them, which was to prevent compulsion altogether in the case of tenanted land, he wished to say that compulsion should always be avoided if possible, because it was peculiarly open to abuse in cases of this kind. Besides that general principle there was behind his case the Parliamentary understanding arrived at in 1903. In the first place they had an overwhelming case on the bare Amendment of his right hon. friend, and if that were not enough to convince the Committee as to its equity and justice there was also the declared intention of Ministers, and what he understood to be the intention of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, namely, to put into the Bill some clear and plain direction which would obviate the manifest injustice which would be done by the Bill in its present form.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said he was glad that the Government had taken up the attitude they had, because the provision under discussion was one of the most vital and one which in his view made the Bill a satisfactory measure. The arguments used by the Chief Secretary were overwhelming and unanswerable when he said that he could not recommend the Bill to the House and ask for the necessary monetary aid from the Treasury unless it were a complete measure. It would be absurd for the right hon. Gentleman to attempt to pass a Bill which would still leave outside the settlement a number of the very worst cases of evicted tenants in the whole of Ireland. To say that a Bill could be justified to the House of Commons and the Treasury which would leave out of its scope cases like that of Lord Clanricarde would be absurd. The speech of the Leader of the Opposition was a very interesting one, and during a portion of it he appeared to be taking a reasonable line of argument. He seemed to be arguing not in favour of the Amendment which excludud compulsion in the case of tenanted land altogether from the Act, but that there might be cases in which the tribunal could not be trusted to do justice to individuals. The right hon. Gentleman had drawn a picture of his idea of a planter who had invested his capital in the land, who was a genuine agriculturist living in peace and amity with the whole neighbourhood, and then he asked would it not be a monstrously unjust thing compulsorily to put that man out of his holding. The Bill suggested nothing of the kind. [OPPOSITION cries of "Yes, it does."] The Bill gave a power and discretion to the Estates Commissioners to deal with those cases, but it did not provide that they were to be forced compulsorily to put out every man who was a new tenant of any land in Ireland. He would give the Committee an opposite case. Let them take as an instance a man who, perhaps, was a corner boy in some great city in Ireland, who was brought down during the stress of the land war and put on to a farm under a nominal rent which was never collected from him, who had never worked the land, and who had been from that day to this a centre of trouble and disorder to the district. Did the Leader of the Opposition contend that in such a case this tribunal should not have the power, if it chose to exercise it, under strict regulations to remove that man from his holding and reinstate the evicted tenant? Manifestly if the Commissioners had not that power this Bill would not be a settlement of the question at all. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the Government ought to put limiting words into the Bill. He wished to point out that limiting words were already to be found in the third subsection which provided—

> "No tenanted land shall be acquired compulsorily unless it is in the occupation of a new tenant to whom this Act applies and unless the Estates Commissioners, having regard to all the circumstances of the case, of the holding and the district, and of the cost involved, consider it expedient that the evicted tenant should be reinstated as a purchaser of the land."

That was a distinct direction to the tribunal that before they compulsorily took over any tenanted land from a new tenant they must inquire into the circumstances of the case. That was to say, they must find out the character of the man, whether he was a genuine tenant and a good agriculturist; they must inquire into the circumstances under which he came there and take into account all the circumstances of the district, and unless they were satisfied, having regard to all these matters, that it was expedient for the purpose of carrying out the policy of the Act that he should be put out and the old tenant put back, they would have no power to exercise compulsion. He defied them to put into an Act of Parliament a schedule of all the cases in which the tribunal was to reinstate a tenant or in which they were not to reinstate him. They must trust to the discretion of the tribunal, for it would be an improper thing to put powers of this kind into the hands of a tribunal which they could not trust. When they came to that point in the Bill hon. Members above the gangway would have an opportunity of stating their reasons for distrusting the Estates Commissioners. The Leader of the Opposition and hon. Members behind him had said that many of the Nationalist Members including himself were debarred from raising and arguing this question on account of declarations they made in 1903 to the effect that they did not want compulsion to be applied to the new tenant. He would like to remind the House of the circumstances under which those declarations were made. It would be remembered that the Land Act of 1903 was an entirely voluntary Act in every detail, and many of them took the strongest views and expressed them during the debate that in the end compulsion would probably have to be resorted to although they accepted the Act of 1903 as a great experiment. Undoubtedly at that time they expressed the view that without compulsion the matter would not be finally and completely settled. Upon the question of the evicted tenants they were influenced by the fact that the Estates Commissioners were given great powers, and they were greatly moved at the time by the arguments of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover, who believed and stated that it would be a wise thing for the Nationalist Members to let that voluntary experiment be fairly tried. It was argued against that course that, whilst they did not apply legal compulsion, illegal compulsion was being applied by the Nationalist organisation, and the pressure of public opinion might be brought to bear upon those tenants to force them to go out. It was in reply to that remark that he made the statement which had been quoted. He stated that, so far as he was concerned, and so far as any influence which he possessed was concerned, compulsion outside of the law would not be applied to the planters. That pledge had been amply fulfilled since the Land Act of 1903 was passed. He knew of no outside compulsion having been brought to bear on these planters to compel them to give up their holdings. Certainly he had not used, and he had not advised the use of, such compulsion, and he had fulfilled to the letter the pledge which had been quoted from the speech he made in 1903. But now an entirely new situation had arisen. It was not a question now of outside intimidation at all. It was a question of applying legal compulsion to the whole system of land tenure established under the Act of 1903. In this instance the Government were proposing to apply legal compulsion only in a limited number of cases, and if they were to depart from the voluntary arrangement which was come to in 1903, and which he believed had proved in most essential respects a failure, and take up the principle of compulsion, why should it be applied to the landlords only and not to the new tenants? If they applied compulsion for the purpose of settling the evicted tenants question, it should be applied all round. There was no reason why it should be applied to one section more than another. For these reasons he was glad the Government had taken up the attitude they had done, and he hoped they would give no undertaking whatever to introduce other words than were in Subsection (3) which, in his opinion, sufficiently limited the power and discretion of the Estates Commissioners.

Mr. MOORE said the Chief Secretary was singularly silent and diffident when he was asked to reconcile his own statements with the statements of the representative of the Government in another place. He preserved a very discreet silence, although in the concluding portion of his remarks he proceeded to qualify his statements by saying it would be a monstrous thing to turn out an honest, hardworking tenant. With regard to what the hon. and learned Member had just said, he had no hesitation in saying in his presence that for his own part, having read the entire debate on the passing of the Land Act of 1903, he construed the language which the hon. Member then used as a distinct pledge that there should be a settlement of the evicted tenants question for all time. There was to be neither indirect compulsion nor terrorism—as to which the hon. Member was able to give a pledge that there should be none—nor was there to be by legislation anything which would interfere with the *status* of the new tenants. The hon. Member might not have intended it, but he thought the House must be bound by his record. The hon. Member had said that the only pledge he gave during the debate of 1903 was that indirect moral compulsion was not to be used against these men. The pledge the hon. Member gave went considerably further than that. The pledge he gave was that the voluntary settlement of the Act of 1903 was to be accepted as the concluding step in legislation as affecting the *status* of the new tenants; and that there was no intention to put into the Bill any provision by which pressure direct or indirect could be brought to bear on the existing tenants; and that he would not give his assent to any attempt compulsorily to get them out. Was not the Bill an attempt compulsorily to get them out? From start to finish of the debate of 1903 a pledge was given by hon. Members below the gangway to accept the settlement of the evicted tenants question by voluntary proceedings, and in his judgment it was a distinct violation of that pledge now actively to support the present proposals. He thought some good might be done for Ireland if parties could agree, but there could only be agreement when mutual pledges were given and the minority taught that the pledges given by the majority would be loyally observed. [Laughter.] It seemed to be a matter of merriment to some Gentlemen that Parliamentary pledges of this nature should be entered into and then three and a half years after, although no case was made for it, be deliberately abandoned because a subservient Government was in power. The Bill proposed to settle the evicted tenants question by carrying out other evictions. Whom was it proposed to evict? It proposed to evict the people who had had the courage, enterprise, and industry at great risk to themselves to take up farms in different parts of the country twenty-five years ago. These were the people whom it was now determined to settle the whole evicted tenants question by expropriating. The right hon. Gentleman had said that where a new tenant was not a cause of disturbance he was to be allowed to stay. But there was the converse case. He appeared to be having *ex parte* reports from his friends the majority of the Estates Commissioners—[A NATIONALIST MEMBER: Who appointed them?]—and he had laid down the proposition that when a man was a centre of disturbance—a euphemistic way of describing matters—he was to be evicted from his farm. In other words where he had been boycotted, his cattle driven off, and himself made unpopular, where he was exposed to the fulminations of the United Irish League, he there became, in the words of the right hon. Gentleman, a centre of disturbance. The Government were going to do what the United Irish League could not do. The two Estates Commissioners were going to complete the work which the United Irish League had failed to complete. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the British taxpayer did not object to putting his hands into his pockets when justice required it, but he was not inclined to put his hands into his pockets when injustice was to be done. Unless this Amendment was accepted it would be the poor farmer who would suffer. The landlord would be allowed to remain untouched. And these were the provisions of a democratic Government! They were told that the solution of the difficulty lay in the fact that the Estates Commissioners were to have regard to the whole circumstances of the district. The right hon. Gentleman had let in a little light. He had told them that one of the circumstances might be that a man was unpopular or had acted so as to bring himself into disfavour with his neighbours. He could not understand anything easier than to get a man evicted under the provisions of this Bill. What could be easier than to get up a cry that such and such a man was unpopular? They had only to write to Dublin Castle and get a cohort of police sent down and the man became a centre of disturbance and had to go out. Up to now the Estates Commissioners had never acted judicially, but now when they would have two administrative officials sent down purporting to act judicially *ad hoc*, but holding office under the Lord-Lieutenant and obeying the directions of the Chief Secretary, the directions would be as the right hon. Gentleman had said, that the first thing to be done was to restore the evicted tenant to his holding and turn the new tenant out. That was one of the circumstances of the case, and he did not think the safeguard was one for which anyone would advance a farthing. In order to gratify resentment of loyalty in a particular neighbourhood, a man was to be driven out even although he might only have a 20-acre holding. Many of the new tenants had very small holdings, but, under the provisions of the Bill, instead of taking and putting an evicted tenant on untenanted land and giving him a 40-acre farm, they were going to gratify his old malice and spite and create fresh heart-burnings by turning out the new tenant in order to reinstate the evicted tenant. Sooner than give him 40 acres of untenanted land, they preferred to turn a planter out of his wretched

20 acres. Wherever they went there would be pitfalls, and they could not safeguard against injustice unless they inserted the word "untenanted." He and his friends had a deep interest in the question, because many of the new tenants came from the part of the country they represented. They were blood of their blood and bone of their bone. They had held their own successfully for a large number of years, and, if Parliament did not interfere unfairly, they would continue to do so in spite of all the United Irish Leagues. So far as they were concerned, even though Parliamentary pledges might be broken, and even if they were opposed by the Government majority, they would fight the cause of these men who were being unfairly treated, and endeavour to prevent the gross injustice which would result if tenanted land was unnecessarily acquired under the Bill.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) said he understood the taxpayers were to be asked to provide some of the necessary money, and he therefore wanted to know, before he consented to that money being used for the purposes of the Bill, how the measure was going to work. He understood that its object was to secure peace and harmony in Ireland by putting an end to all the trouble which had arisen from the evicted tenants question. Although the Chief Secretary considered the number of evicted tenants to be dealt with was something like 2,000, hon. Members who knew the circumstances put the number at not less than 8,000. It therefore seemed to him that the money the taxpayers were going to be asked to find would in reality be five times as much as that which the promoters of the Bill put forward. He wanted to know clearly from some representative of the Government whether they contemplated the reinstatement of 8,000 or 2,000 evicted tenants, and what were the grounds they had for putting the number of 2,000 forward. If they did not give their reasons they were not dealing fairly with the Committee. He thought that if the Amendment were carried and only untenanted land used, there would be considerably less danger to the pockets of the taxpayer. The Chief Secretary had argued that their fears of injustice resulting to sitting tenants ought to be allayed by subsection (3). He could not see that. The Chief Secretary, on his own showing, had introduced a Bill with a provision which might produce monstrous results. It might lead to a gross and monstrous injustice, but he asked them to compose themselves because they were safeguarded by subsection (3). Anything more flimsy and valueless was never put in a Bill as a safeguard. The proposition was absurd. The circumstances of the case were to be considered by the Estates Commissioners, and therefore, the right hon. Gentleman said, there would be no injustice done. Would it be one of the circumstances compulsorily to turn out the planter, the honest tenant, in favour of the dishonest tenant? The main object of the Bill was to evict the tenant who was honestly in his holding and replace him by the man who was rightly evicted. Having turned the honest man out, they had to take into consideration the circumstances of the case. They were going to put an evicted tenant on a certain corner of an estate on terms absolutely different from those on which the other tenants on the estate held their holdings. There would arise an agitation among the other tenants for equal terms with the man who had replaced the honest man who had been evicted. If that resulted in a general lowering of rents and in upsetting the peace and harmony on the property, would the Commissioners give consideration to those circumstances of the case and award the landlord compensation for the injury inflicted upon him? Would they give any compensation to the other tenants who were in peaceable possession and who wished to remain so for the injury inflicted upon them by a man being put on the estate on perfectly different terms? He could not see that subsection (3) gave any real and reasonable protection against the monstrous possibility of injustice which the right hon. Gentleman had himself allowed was in the Bill. He had told them that he had made inquiries as to how the planters had been doing their work. It seemed to him that that was hardly the business of the right hon.

Gentleman. What business had he to concern himself with the way in which the tenants of other people were doing their duty? It was for the landlords to be satisfied that their tenants were properly farming their land, and he regarded it as an unjustifiable interference on the part of the right hon. Gentleman that he should go poking his official nose into the relations between landlord and tenant. The right hon. Gentleman said he had come to the conclusion that they were doing their work well. That, however, would not save them under the Bill. However well they had done their work, and however satisfactory they were as tenants and neighbours, it would not save them. They might, under the Bill, be made to go out in order to be replaced by men who were not at all likely to be centres of peace, harmony, and concord. The Government were setting an absolute premium on disloyalty and doing their utmost to discourage loyalty and fair play. He could not see how the right hon. Gentleman had allayed their fears; he could not see how the condition of Ireland was going to be improved, and he was perfectly sure the English taxpayers were going to get no return for their money. If, therefore, there was not going to be fair play and honest treatment he thought they had a right to protest against the Bill and resent it by every means in their power.

MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.) said that on the Second Reading of the Land Act it was brought out very clearly that even the most sanguine of the hon. Members below the gangway did not estimate that there were more than 1,000 evicted tenants likely to require any special treatment. Now, within the space of four years, they were dealing with a small army of over 8,000. Some of them had been already satisfactorily dealt with, and they were now asked to displace peaceful tenants who had been paying their rent and pursuing their industry as law-abiding citizens by a class which was allowed to be the pampered children of legislation. He regretted that the present Chief Secretary had soiled his fingers with the measure. He looked upon it as doubly unfair to what might be termed the Land Act tenants and that increasing army Ireland had every right to be proud of, the farming proprietors. He was satisfied that the Chief Secretary had not grasped the tendency of this legislation. The right hon. Gentleman was bound to ask himself, Was it right that tenants who for one reason or another refused to pay their rent should be treated in a very exceptional manner? In the present state of Ireland, if this policy were adhered to, the Government would incur the gravest responsibility. He hoped that before the consideration of the Bill was far advanced they might find the Chief Secretary approaching the views held by Members on that side of the House and treating the Bill in a very different manner from that in which he had met the overtures of the hon. Member for North Armagh that afternoon. He wished to contest the idea that they, the Members from Ulster, represented the landlord class only.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is irrelevant. I cannot make out from his speech that he knows what the Amendment is about. The Amendment is that untenanted lands only should be subject to compulsory powers.

MR. BARRIE said that he would not pursue that subject. He submitted, however, that the Amendment touched a very important part of the whole subject, that those tenant farmers who had become purchasers of the land and were therefore vitally concerned would be seriously prejudiced, and that the value of their land would be depreciated. He felt very strongly on the subject, representing as he did a constituency where tenant farmers were numerous.

*MR. BUTCHER (Cambridge University) said he was not in the House when the Act of 1903 was carried, and therefore had not the advantage of listening to the Parliamentary compact which was then made. He had, however, studied the debates in the House on that subject. He thought he had read every word in *Hansard* which was then said on the evicted tenants question, and he was very much surprised to hear the version of those debates given that afternoon and also on the Second Reading of the Bill by the hon. and learned Member for Waterford. Not only the Leader of the Irish Party, but every man of importance in that Party agreed, at the time, as to the nature and meaning of the compact. In reading those debates he found that the hon. and learned Member for Waterford, the hon. Member for Cork, the Member for Louth, and other hon. Members, every one of them said the same thing, namely, that no pressure, direct or indirect, was to be brought to bear on these new tenants, that they were in no way to be molested, that if they quitted their holdings with their own consent, well and good, but if not, it was an end of the question. Not a word then about an "experiment," with a final resort to compulsion. In spite, however, of this clear Parliamentary compact, but for which the Act of 1903 would not have been passed, they had now before them a proposal for fresh evictions; and the men who were to be evicted were the men whose rights had then been solemnly guaranteed by the State. Surely any Englishman who valued honour and good faith would think it a base desertion of men who, on the plighted word of Parliament, took land at the risk of their lives, or at the risk of all that made life worth living. They were now told that they must go out, without any cause being assigned, except that they had made themselves unpopular. Why should not the evicted tenants, instead of the new tenants, be settled on the untenanted land? In the Report of the Estates Commissioners it was said that the evicted tenants were unwilling to go to a distance, and, secondly, that if they did so, they would meet with local opposition. If it was true, as he believed it was, that the evicted tenants would meet with what was euphemistically called local opposition, was it likely, with the history of the evicted tenants and the planters before their eyes, that the new tenants would have a happy time in the districts to which they were migrated? Yet the evicted tenants were to have their feelings spared at the expense of those others to whom both the State and the landlords were deeply committed by honourable obligation. It was said in the debates of 1903, and he had heard it repeated in the debate on this Bill, "Let us wipe out the past; the chapter of war has closed and the chapter of peace has begun." That was the tone and temper of the House and of the Irish Party also at that time. And even now all Unionist Members were willing to wipe out the past and close that page. But the Government by this proposal for compulsory dispossession re-opened the page, they renewed the war, and if they were forced to enter into the respective merits of the two sets of tenants, could any impartial man maintain that those who had lived honestly and paid their rent had not prior claims to those who had refused to pay rent and had gone out at the bidding of an illegal conspiracy? What were the relative merits of the men whom the Government proposed to dispose of, and the men whom they proposed to put back on these holdings? He did not believe that any impartial man could have any doubt that the merits of men who had lived honestly and paid their way were greater than those who had not.

*THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange) said the hon. and learned Member for North Armagh had made one of his usual good fighting speeches, and had brought back to his memory the events which they went through twenty or twenty-five years ago in Ireland, giving a graphic history of the Ulster planters or of the new tenants, and how they were maintained there, and would be maintained, by the gallant people of Ulster. They knew the fight went on for years and the hon. Member was most anxious that it should still go on. That was exactly what the Government did not want. They wanted to have an end to this land war. It was understood in 1903 that there would be an end to it and that this nightmare would cease.

MR. MOORE: There was no compulsion in the Act of 1903.

*MR. CHERRY agreed that that was so. But he said it became absolutely necessary now if they were to put an end to this land war. It was necessary in a small number of cases that compulsion should be applied.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL asked whether it was to be put an end to in the way the hon. and learned Gentleman suggested. Did the hon. and learned Gentleman intend to remove all the planters?

*MR. CHERRY said it would be left to the Land Commissioners to say who should be removed and who not. He was anxious to point out to the Committee that the Government was not dealing unjustly with these tenants. Some Members were evidently not aware of the very generous terms offered by the Bill. When it was intended to dispossess a man, before a single step could be taken it was necessary that the Estates Commissioners should offer him a farm as valuable as that of which he was to be dispossessed. If he said he wished to give up farming altogether and did not want another farm he could get full compensation in the same way as he would get it if the holding was resumed by the landlord. They were seeking for fairness and justice to everybody. Was there anything harsh about the Bill? These men were to be taken away from a part of Ireland in which they said they were fighting for their lives and were to be placed in a peaceful part of the country. Were the Government to be debarred from taking these steps? Was one man to be allowed to keep a whole county in a turmoil? Supposing they had ten of these stalwart Ulster champions who came down in 1886 and nine were removed with their own consent, but one obstinate man refused to go. [Cries of "Well done!"] Well done! Yes, if he fought alone well and good; but he necessitated the Government fighting with a whole army of police. They had been accused by hon. Members opposite in harsh terms of confiscation and so on. But they had cases in Ireland where one obstinate man had kept a whole county in a turmoil. It was for these people they were endeavouring to provide, and they could not provide for them in more specific terms than they were doing. They thought it was sufficient to leave it in the hands of the three gentlemen appointed by the late Government. They thought they could rely on their discretion, judgment, and sense of fair play as to what men should be removed. If the Estates Commissioners decided it was necessary to remove a particular man, then before a step was taken he must be assured of having a better farm than that which he then occupied. There must be a limit to this thing and to the expense to which the Government were put. The Government were bound to protect these men, but they could not go on for ever employing armies of police; they must do something to put an end to the present state of things. He believed if the Bill were administered justly and fairly they would get rid of the land war without injustice to anyone. They wished to meet the fair demands of the landlords and the tenants and to put back all those who deserved to be reinstated.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) said that the Committee had heard an astounding speech from a Minister who was wholly responsible, at all events as adviser to the Irish Government, for the peace of Ireland. The language in which that speech was couched was remarkable. The right hon. and learned Gentleman had said they only wanted to turn out certain people. He reminded the Government that they were deliberately by that Bill depriving themselves of the right to exercise control over the administration of the Bill by leaving it to the discretion of the Estates Commissioners. It had been the invariable practice of Parliament, when they were placing in another body duties of a responsible and difficult character, and if they did not give definite instructions, at least clearly to indicate in the Bill what the policy of that body ought to be. The Committee had had many assurances both from the Chief Secretary and from the right hon. and learned Gentleman, but anyone who looked into the Bill for an indication of the way it was to be administered would find indications of a most remarkable kind. If the right hon. and learned Gentleman's speech meant anything at all it meant that the eviction of new tenants was to be on a much larger scale than was indicated by the Chief Secretary. It meant a denial of the statement made by Lord Crewe in another place. It meant even more. It meant that these men whom he had termed the "storm centres"—and he had spoken in very indignant terms of the obligation cast on the Government of the day to protect these men—it was because they were storm centres and not because they were bad farmers or unworthy men, that they were to be removed.

*MR. CHERRY: I never used the expression " storm centres."

MR. LONG: The right hon. Gentleman referred to them as " centres of disturbance." The reason the Government were going to turn these men out was that they had become unpopular in their districts and it had become necessary to remove them. They had become unpopular because they had farmed their land well and endeavoured to lead peaceful and quiet lives, and the right hon. and learned Gentleman knew perfectly well the methods employed to make them unpopular. The further they got into the discussion of the Bill the more they found that its operation was likely to become more injurious to Ireland than they anticipated in the beginning. The right hon. and learned Gentleman began by saying that the Government introduced the Bill because they thought it would put an end to these unfortunate differences. Was the speech to which they had just listened likely to lead to a peaceful solution; when it was stated that a man was to be removed because he was centre of disturbance? How could it be said the terms of the Bill were generous? Was there any generosity in turning a man out of a holding he did not want to leave and transferring him to another farm in another part of the country to which he did not want to go? Generosity did not come into it at all. It was a question whether there was even fairness or justice in the proposals the Government in regard to the men turned out. At all events they knew now, from the Attorney-General's speech, what was the main object the Government had in view. It was not the restoration of the evicted tenants, who wanted to get back to the homes of their fathers. They knew now that it was the man who had done his duty, and was, therefore, unpopular, who was to be turned out and a stranger put in his place. The Attorney-General had told them that these new tenants who were to be removed from their holdings to make way for evicted tenants were not only to be treated with generosity, but were to be moved to other farms; but it seemed to him that their first duty should be to do their utmost to put the evicted tenant on the acquired land before entering upon the process of evicting an honest and industrious man and moving him across the country to a farm which they must provide for him. Not only was the gravest injustice likely to be done to these new tenants on whose behalf his hon. friends had been arguing, but they introduced a complication into their procedure which was not likely by any means to bring about the result they desired, namely, the pacification of certain parts of Ireland. Nobody could desire the pacification of Ireland more than he, for he had been responsible for a short time for the government of Ireland, and they knew what the Government intended and wanted; but the hon. and learned Gentleman who was more powerful than they, had said in his speech, when challenged as to the language he had used with regard to the Act of 1903, that in the three years which had elapsed since the passing of that Act, the scheme had broken down and the circumstances were entirely altered. What guarantee had the Government that before this Bill, if it became an Act, was two months old, it would not be again said that the conditions had altered, that this wretched Bill had produced no settlement of the question, and that a much larger and wider measure was necessary before these matters could be brought to a peaceful settlement? He believed that not only were the Government proposals, as explained by the Attorney-General, unjust, but that it was astounding that such principles should be enunciated from the Government Bench; and he believed that if that was the spirit in which this Bill was to be administered, instead of bringing peace to the disturbed districts, it was much more likely to inflame them and to increase their difficulties.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) said he wished to point out to the Tory Party the strange and historic position in which they were. For the first time in their history they were championing tenant right. During all the years he had been in that House they had stood up for the rights of landlords; but now their whole powers were completely concentrated on the tenant right of those who were called "planters." Was that their position in regard to the Land Act of 1881 and the Land Act of 1870; was that the position they took up with regard to the Agricultural Holdings (England) Act, or the Scottish Small Holdings or the English Small Holdings measures? Their whole career had been one of denunciation of the idea that the tenant had any right or interest in the soil whatsoever; whereas now the most extraordinary invocations went up at the idea of confiscating the rights of the new tenant, who was a mere excrescence, a wart as the result of the land war. If the present tenant was such an admirable person, one to be cherished, what would the English farmers be saying at the next general election? Let them go to Wiltshire, Cumberland, and the inland counties of England, and tell the stout yeoman how they had fought for the land grabber, and then what would these yeoman say ought to be done for them? Who were these new tenants? Was it worth while to take this action with regard to them? They had given up to the Boers, without very much struggle, the rights of the planters whom they had sent out at enormous expense and at their risk, and there was not so much as a grunt in that House on the subject. It was said that there was no precedent for what was being done here. But let them take the case of the Hotel Cecil in the Strand. In that case respectable shopkeepers were turned out of their premises in order that the Hotel Cecil might be built, and that something might be obtained for the widows and orphans who had suffered by the operations of Jabez Balfour, Hobbs, and operators of that kind. If they were willing to do that for the first time in their history, and do it in the City of London for private gain, because it amounted to that, what case had they against the executive Government of the day who said that no doubt these people had acquired rights under the Land Act? What was the amount of hardship inflicted upon them? Some of them were admittedly persons who had been brought he did not care whether from the North of Ireland or elsewhere, and who were about as good farmers as he was. They knew nothing about farming; they were brought down surrounded by police, and were a standing source of trouble. The Conservative Government, to its honour—and he had always said that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover and the late Prime Minister deserved enormous credit for the manner in which they handled this question—went out of their historic course in order to appease matters in Ireland. What did the present Government propose to do? It said to these men: "Some of you may have to go; you are most admirable people, but you cost us too much in the way of police and too much local trouble." Not one of these men would be disturbed unless the three gentlemen appointed by the Tory Party—Mr. Wrench, Mr. Bailey, and Mr. Finucane—first said that it was equitable that any one of these planters should be dispossessed; and if an evicted tenant was restored to his former home, the excluded tenant would be provided with another farm and be paid suitable compensation. He remembered a Judge saying many years ago that there was hardly any question that ever came before the Court that could not be solved by the application of the principle of costs. These men were to get compensation, and they should remember that this tribunal would conduct its operations under the vigilant and watchful eyes of hon. Gentlemen above the gangway. If there was a particle of injustice in this proposal the Tory Party, both in the Lords and in the Commons, could call attention to it. This was a small Bill, and he asked hon. Gentlemen above the gangway whether, for the sake of a small measure of this kind, it was worth their while to set the minds and thoughts of the Irish people once more into keen antagonism with the landlord class. It was useless for them to appeal to the Unionist Party in Ireland, because they were playing the old game. With them it was the Battle of the Boyne and they were defending the walls of Derry. He appealed to Englishmen who wanted a contented

Ireland to look at this matter with good sense, and believe that a tribunal composed of men appointed by the late Government was a proper and suitable one which would do no injustice.

MR. WYNDHAM (Dover) said the hon. and learned Member had evidently altogether overlooked the most important factor in the case they were considering. This was not a question determined by the size of the operation contemplated by the Bill, and it was not a question of the competency of the tribunal set up. The real question was whether those who were sitting on the Opposition Benches were in 1907 to carry out the explicit pledges they gave in the year 1903. Speaking in that year on the 29th June, during a debate in which the hon. and learned Member for Waterford contributed statements which had been quoted to-day, he, as the Minister responsible for commending that measure to the House of Commons, used these words—

> "They practically came to an agreement on the previous Wednesday when he ventured to lay down three principles: (1) that it was desirable to settle the evicted tenants question; (2) that no pressure in favour of the evicted tenants should be put on those holdings now in the occupation of others; and (3) that in using the powers of this Bill to settle the land question, they ought not to single out one class for preferential treatment to the detriment of another class."

That declaration was not challenged at the time, and it was on the strength of that statement that he was able to persuade a number of hon. Members to support that measure. It was notorious that in another place his statement was largely instrumental in reversing an adverse vote upon this very question of the evicted tenants. In the first instance the Government proposals were thrown out and upon being re-introduced they were carried on the strength of that declaration which he made as Minister in charge of the Bill. Under those circumstances he should vote for this Amendment, and it seemed to him impossible that any person in his condition could do otherwise than offer an uncompromising opposition to this clause in the Bill. The Chief Secretary for Ireland had said that he had to consider the social side of the Irish land question, and he quite agreed with him in that contention. He agreed that much might be done by considering the social aspect of the question, but it was more important that those who had said a thing should stand by what they had said, and that was the course he proposed to take that afternoon.

MR. ASHLEY said the hon. and learned Member for Louth had twitted the Tory Party with being champions in the cause of the new tenants in Ireland whilst they were opposed to conferring the same benefits on the tenants in England. Surely the hon. and learned Member forgot that the laws in regard to land in England were very different from those in Ireland. He appeared to have forgotten the passing of the Land Act of 1881 and the Act of 1903, and surely the least they ought to do was to see that the rights of any particular class of tenants under that Act were not whittled away.

MR. T. M. HEALY said that none of those tenants had any right under the Act of 1881.

MR. ASHLEY said he would not press that view, although some hon. Members sitting near him differed from the hon. and learned Member on the point. The Attorney-General for Ireland seemed to take some exception to the speech made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin, and his interpretation of the words he was supposed to have uttered. What the right hon. Gentleman asked was whether one obstinate man was to keep the whole country in a turmoil. That meant to say that the Government had concluded that a man who had broken no law, who was a good farmer, who was living perfectly within his rights, was no longer to have police protection afforded to him.

MR. CHERRY said he stated nothing of the kind, and what he said was the very reverse.

MR. ASHLEY said that under the circumstances he had mentioned the Government claimed the right to turn the tenant out.

MR. CHERRY said that if the Commissioners took that course they would have to offer him a farm in another part of the country. No tenant would be removed to a holding in another part of the country against his will, and if he refused the offer he would be entitled to compensation.

MR. ASHLEY said the fact remained that a man might be put out of his holding, where he was living peaceably, simply because the Commissioners thought the evicted tenant should be re-instated there. He wished to draw the attention of the Committee to a statement made by the Vice-President of the Board of Agriculture in 1894. He said—

> "He could never be brought to vote for any proposal which said to a man who had lived peaceably for twelve or fourteen years upon his holding, 'You must give up your holding to the man who formerly had it.'"

The hon. and learned Member for Waterford in the course of his speech had very fairly drawn the opposite picture to that of the Leader of the Opposition. He had drawn a picture of a corner boy from one of the cities who was not a genuine farmer and who ought not, he contended, to receive any consideration at the hands of the House. The hon. and learned Member stated that such a tenant might be assessed at a nominal rent which was never collected. According to his reading of the Act a man who did not pay any rent would not be included in this Amendment, because he would be living upon untenanted land. They would have just as much difficulty in placing these new tenants on other farms as in reinstating the evicted tenants. It was a matter of common knowledge that certain evicted tenants on the Clanricarde estate were assigned holdings on another estate at no great distance away. They were taken there under the ægis of one of the officials of the Estates Commissioners, and that caused such an outcry in regard to the land being wanted for the enlargement of uneconomic holdings that the whole scheme fell through. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: That is not so.] The same difficulty would arise when they removed these new tenants, and he could not see how the provision of these new holdings was going to be carried out.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham) said an hon. Member had stated that he could now go down to Essex and Wiltshire and tell the farmers there that the Opposition in this House were supporting the land-grabbers in Ireland. Instead of that, let the hon. Member tell the farmers that they were opposing a Government which was bringing in a Bill to eject from their holdings perfectly honourable and honest men who were carrying on their business in a perfectly honourable way, on the ground that some visionary amateur revolutionists wished to see them ejected from their holdings; that the Government was too weak to protect them, having too much sympathy with those people to see that the tenants were retained in their holdings and proper protection was given to them for the carrying on of their business. Would the right hon. Gentleman also tell them that £2,000,000 of English money was being wrung from taxpayers who were not rich enough to give old-age pensions, in order that these men might be ejected, and that the amateur revolutionists might be put on the holdings? He had listened to some extraordinary speeches from the Attorney-General for Ireland, but he had never heard a more extraordinary speech from him than that which he had delivered that afternoon. There was something tragic besides comic in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman. It was only one of a series of speeches made by members of the Government which were having, and would have, an unfortunate effect in Ireland, and would encourage rather than diminish lawlessness. It was an extraordinary thing to him that now, in the twentieth century, a member of a Government with an enormous majority behind it should declare that he was unable or unwilling to protect the people who were carrying on their business in a perfectly proper way——

MR. CHERRY: I did not say that: I said just the very reverse. What I said was that we are willing and anxious to protect them and will continue to do so.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR said he distinctly understood the Attorney-General to say that this could not go on for ever. However, he did not wish to dispute the right hon. and learned Gentleman's explanation, but he thought he would not dissent from him when he said that the whole object of the speech, and the meaning to be deduced from it, was to the effect that the Government could not afford protection to these men in the future.

Mr. CHERRY: I said the very reverse. I said that as they were there we would continue to give them protection, but I said it was not a reasonable thing that they should insist upon staying there.

Viscount TURNOUR said that he had no wish to continue this rather Irish cross-examination. [Nationalist cries of "Oh! oh!" and "Order! order!"] He meant nothing disrespectful to the right hon. and learned Gentleman. All he could say was that they on that side of the House were unfortunate in having put the construction they had put upon his speech. The inference drawn by himself and many of his friends was that the Government were unwilling to give protection in the future to these men. If that was not the construction which the right hon. and learned Member intended to be put on his words then he apologised for misconstruing what he had said. But, at any rate, the fact remained that what he himself said before still held good, and the right hon. and learned Gentleman did not deny it. He admitted that one of the great objects of bringing in the Bill was to remove those people who were carrying on their business in a perfectly honest way. He (Viscount Turnour) was entirely opposed to that view. These men were honest and honourable men, and they should be allowed to stay. What had struck him most about the speech was that the right hon. Gentleman was much more violent than the hon. Member for Waterford had been during the course of the debate in 1903. The hon. Member for Waterford said it was not his intention to put in the Bill any pressure, direct or indirect, with regard to the planters, and that he would not sanction compulsory measures to get them out. He did not propose to deal with the reasons which led the hon. Member to alter his opinion in such an extraordinary fashion. What was more extraordinary was the way in which the Government had out-Heroded Herod. The Attorney-General was much more violent in 1907 than the hon. Member for Waterford in 1903. To an English Member the whole thing was a continual puzzle.

Mr. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): Better give it up.

Viscount TURNOUR said it appeared that in regard to agricultural problems in Ireland one had to be either a moonlighter or imprisoned. Every English Member and every Member representing an agricultural constituency should be opposed to this clause in the Bill if only on the ground that it proposed to prevent people from carrying on their business in a legitimate way. The Bill proposed to endow—perhaps it would be too strong to use the word lawlessness—but it proposed to endow certain people in Ireland whom he should think it was highly undesirable to endow, with two millions of English money. He hoped that the explanation which the Attorney-General had given would be noted in Ireland and thus prevent lawlessness which would otherwise have happened.

Mr. BIRRELL appealed to the Committee to come to a decision on the Amendment now before them. Many of the questions which had been referred to in the discussion would come up hereafter. The Bill having been reserved for Committee of the whole House, he hoped they would show a businesslike example by not unnecessarily prolonging the debate on this one point.

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL said he would like to get an answer from the right hon. Gentleman on one matter. There seemed to be a great controversy between the hon. Member for Waterford and the right hon. Gentleman as to whether the Bill was to apply to all the planters of Ireland. Speaking in another place Lord Crewe said he thought that the hon. Member for Waterford and the hon. Member for Cork City dealt with the point in 1903, and that they held the view which the Government also held, that when a man was shown to be a *bona fide* tenant farmer working his land, and desiring to retain it, he certainly ought not to be dispossessed. That was the view of Lord Crewe a few days ago, but the hon. Member for Waterford had repudiated it, saying that that was all right four years ago, but the pledge given then had lapsed. The Bill of 1903 was not a compulsory Bill and this was, and therefore the hon. Member appealed to the Chief Secretary not to give any assurance or make any qualification of any kind. It was impossible, listening to the extraordinary speech of the Attorney-General, to come to any other conclusion than that he agreed with the hon. Member for Waterford that it was essential in order to end the matter that all these planters should be turned out. If the right hon. Gentleman would say that he would give effect to what was the desire of the Government, and what the right hon. Gentleman had said was his desire also, that he would accept an Amendment which he would move later on that the compulsory powers were not to apply to any new tenant who used and occupied land as a tenant farm, some progress might be made, but unless he gave that assurance the Committee would be left in the position that, while they had the right hon. Gentleman saying he accepted the view of the Government expressed by Lord Crewe in another place, on the other hand they had the hon. Member for Waterford asking the Government not to give way on this point and to permit no qualification whatever.

MR. BIRRELL said that the hon. Member for Waterford had read the language of sub-section 3 and expressed his opinion that that was sufficient to meet the necessities of the case; but that did not arise on this Amendment as to untenanted land. They would have a fair opportunity of considering the Amendment of the right hon. and learned Member for Dublin University when they came to subsection (3). Certainly the language of Lord Crewe was not intended to be inconsistent with the language of the Bill. He was sure that nothing was further from Lord Crewe's intention than to use language which might be seized upon by hon. Members as showing that he differed from the Government. [AN HON. MEMBER: What was his object?] His object was to express his belief that under this particular clause the Estates Commissioners would be bound to take into consideration all the circumstances of the case. It was all very well to deal with imaginary cases, but there were plenty of planters in Ireland—he could not say that he was familiar with their names and places—whom it would be most unjust to remove. There were others who he thought could be removed under the liberal provisions of the Bill without any injustice whatever, and they had sufficiently indicated to the tribunal how they were to deal with the question, They were not entitled to acquire land compulsorily unless they were satisfied it was expedient in all the circumstances of the case that an evicted tenant should be restored. If hon. Gentlemen opposite were going to proceed as he thought they had shown some indication of proceeding—on the assumption that the Bill was going to be intentionally worked with injustice and so as to cause the greatest amount of social disturbance, he quite agreed that it was almost hopeless to use to them any argument; but the Government believed that that was not so. He thought the language was quite sufficient, but he was prepared to listen to any arguments of the right hon. Gentleman or anybody else when the Committee came to that particular subsection. He hoped that before long the Committee would come to a decision on this Amendment.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) said the right hon. Gentleman had refused to accept the suggestion of his right hon. friend, but said they must trust the Commissioners, and that was his strongest argument. Let them consider what that came to. He did not for a moment think that any hon. Members on that side of the House viewed the Bill in the manner which the right hon. Gentleman had just suggested; they did not believe for a moment that the Bill was going to be worked in an unjust manner, or that that was the intention. What they did believe was that they were going to put into the hands of the Commissioners powers which they ought not to put into the hands of any tribunal, unless they hedged those powers about with clear directions as to the manner in which they were to be used. He himself did not believe in putting the lives and property of any people in the power of three men, whoever they might be, without proper directions as to the way in which they were going to carry out those powers. An hon. Member had said that these Commissioners were appointed by the Conservative Party. He did not care whom they were appointed by; that did not alter the argument in the least; if they had been appointed by the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant he should have said the same thing, and he believed the Chief Secretary would have put in as good a man as he could. Those three men might be changed; they might die, they might resign, and they might have all sorts of people put in their place—he did not mean put in wilfully, but by accident. Hon. Members might laugh, but he had heard them say over and over again that they did not agree with the findings of magistrates or judges. They had not brought any accusation of partiality against those judges, but they merely said they did not agree with their findings. The Member for North Louth had asked why the Tory Party was on this occasion supporting the tenants instead of the landlords, and he regretted that that Gentleman was not now in the House, because he really rose to give him the reason. They were supporting these new tenants, as they were called, because they considered their cause was just. They had supported the landlords because they considered their cause was just, and the Tory Party, he believed, would always support a cause if they considered that it was just. He would also point out that the hon. and learned Member's illustration of the Hotel Cecil had nothing to do with the case in point. That was under a Private Bill of the London County Council to improve the communication between Holborn and the Strand.

Mr. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): It was not brought in by the London County Council.

Sir F. BANBURY: I think I am right.

Mr. T. M. HEALY: You are not.

Sir F. Banbury.

Sir F. BANBURY said the Bill was brought in for an improvement in the streets of London, and it had nothing whatever to do with the present case. The hon. and learned Member for Waterford and the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant said they could not accept this Amendment, because it would not make it a complete Bill. That meant that the tenants must be turned out of their homes; otherwise they would not get the land for the old tenants; and the result would be that the Treasury would have to pay an enormous sum of money, because whenever an evicted tenant was reinstated in his old home another evicted tenant would be created, and what was going to happen to him? Were they, as English taxpayers, to find land for the evicted tenant a second time? The Attorney-General said there was no question of confiscation because a new farm was provided. But why did he go through all this round-about procedure? Why not put the original evicted tenant into the new farm? He did not say where he was going to get the land from, but could he answer that question? He had got to get land for the planter. If he had got a farm, why could not he put the old evicted tenant in it instead of turning out the planter? It seemed to him a very simple problem, and it was apparently so simple that he could not answer it.

Mr. CHERRY said his answer was that if a man had been in Ulster it would be foolish to put him in a farm in Connaught.

Sir F. BANBURY said they therefore came to the fact that it was a social and political result that was desired, and not merely justice to any particular class of people. It was because political pressure had been put on the Government by hon. Gentlemen below the gangway that they were to have this Bill. He was very glad for the admission of the right hon. Gentleman, who had made some very startling admissions during the course of that debate, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would contribute to the debates again, because his contributions were extremely interesting. He had only one or two more words to say, and he did not think hon. Gentlemen below the gangway would like them. He was going to give another reason why the Tory Party was taking up this attitude. They believed in protecting a man who was only doing his duty, and they did not believe in protecting or giving a premium to a man who had failed to do his duty. The Tory Party believed that these evicted tenants were turned out because they broke their agreements and would not pay their rents. And if they were unable to pay their rents they were not competent people and ought not to be reinstated; if they could not make farming a success, and so could not pay their rents, they were incompetent people and were not likely to make farming a success. But if they could pay their rents, and did not do so, they were dishonest and ought not to be put back into farms occupied by honest men who had paid their rent, and for that reason, which he believed would appeal to all Englishmen, from whatever part of the country they happened to come, he should be only too willing to address an audience in his own town in furtherance of what he had said in his opposition to the Bill. No greater blow would be given to the present Government than would be given by their insistence on the passing of this unjust Bill.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) said the Attorney-General for Ireland had spoken in very eloquent terms about the generous treatment that was to be offered to the so-called new tenants, but he would like the House to consider what those terms were. This question was closely connected with the question of on whom the powers given by this Bill of deciding the price of the land to be taken were conferred. The Estates Commissioners, who they on that side of the House had no hesitation in saying had not in any way the confidence of the landlords in Ireland, had vested in them most extraordinary powers. It was left to them, in the first instance, to say which of these new tenants ought to be dispossessed of their farms, and, in the second place, to decide practically what compensation was to be given to those new tenants when dispossessed, and further the unfortunate new tenants were deprived of anything in the way of an appeal against the decision of the Estates Commissioners. He did not think any hon. Member opposite if he applied the circumstances they were discussing to an analogous state of affairs in this country, would for one moment admit that that was a fair or reasonable way of compensating a man if they proposed to take away his property.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is going into details as to what the Estates Commissioners will do, but that question arises much more upon subsection (3).

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said the hon. and learned Member had called this tenant who was to be dispossessed of his holding an obstinate man, and he thought that that was a most unfortunate phrase for a Minister of the Crown to use in reference to any tenant or any person connected with land in Ireland. The effect of such an expression must be the same as that of numerous statements made during this session by the Chief Secretary, the Attorney-General, and other members of the Government with reference to tenants in Ireland. What view did they think, in the event of this Bill not passing into law, the evicted tenants would take of such an expression as that? They would say that the Government was clearly at their backs in the matter; that the Government recognised their position and the hardships of it, and they would be determined to agitate as they had done in the past, and in the particularly horrible and lawless way which they were now doing, to be reinstated in their old farms. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that it could not be said that the tenants were being turned out of their farms, because they were to be put into other farms. But would he not consider he was being turned out of his house in Dublin if some authority said to him, "Out you go; you must go and live on the other side of the Liffey"? He would like to refer to the Report of the Estates Commissioners upon this matter. They said that they had already 80,000 acres of land in Ireland which could be used for the purpose of reinstating or providing farms for evicted tenants, but they did not propose to use it for the purpose because the bulk of the land was needed for the enlargement of small holdings in the localities in which it was situated; also that the people in those localities would strongly object to the whole or even a considerable portion of the land being set aside for the evicted tenants. If the inhabitants of those localities would strongly object to the land being so used how much more would they object to any portion of it being used for providing farms for the new tenants evicted? Were they asked seriously by the Chief Secretary to believe that he would have no difficulty in finding other farms for these new tenants? The right hon. Gentleman would have more difficulty in finding farms for them than in finding farms for the evicted tenants. The hon. Member for North Mayo, speaking in Mayo—where there were thirteen or fourteen of these new tenants, who had been so rigorously boycotted that one by one they had had to throw up their farms, and only one, Mr. John Hare, who had the spunk in him to refuse to be dictated to, held out—used language which should not be condoned by the right hon. Gentleman who was responsible for the good government of Ireland. The hon. Member said that Jack Hare was a traitor and should be subjected to absolute, rigorous, and complete boycott.

*THE CHAIRMAN said he did not quite see the relevance of these remarks to the particular Amendment under discussion.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG submitted that that was a case of a man who was occupying land with which it was proposed to deal, and it was for the protection of such men that they proposed to confine the Bill to untenanted land. That man was on tenanted land and should not be interfered with.

*THE CHAIRMAN said the matter with which the hon. Gentleman was dealing did not appear to be relevant to this particular Amendment.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said he was speaking against the proposal of the Government to take tenanted lands in cases of the kind to which he had referred. The Attorney-General for Ireland had referred to a man in this position as a nuisance to the neighbourhood, and said he was a centre of disturbance. It therefore seemed to him to be in order to refer to a very glaring case of this kind which had just happened.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think that it is in order to do so.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said he would leave the matter where it was. They had heard an extraordinary speech from the hon. and learned Member for Waterford. They well recollected what took place in 1903. An Act of Parliament was passed which gave very considerable powers in regard to the reinstatement of evicted tenants. It was then most distinctly stated by the hon. and learned Gentleman, speaking on behalf of the Nationalist Party, that they looked upon that measure as a final settlement. This was particularly important, because the hon. and learned Gentleman had declared that this Bill would not satisfy him as the Irish Council Bill also had not satisfied him, and therefore this Bill he supposed would be dropped. The fate of the Bill was in the hands of the hon. and learned Member for Waterford. Assuming, however, that the hon. and learned Gentleman did say that he regarded the former Bill as being in the nature of an experiment to which he was willing to give a fair trial, he (Mr. Craig) said that it had not had a fair trial. He went further and said that the particular clause dealing with this question in the Act of 1903 had affected 50 per cent. more than the hon. and learned Gentleman ever expected that it would do. At that time, talking of the evicted tenants, the hon. and learned Gentleman said that their number was very small, and that the whole question could be settled for £100,000; and from the speeches of himself and hon. Members below the gangway it was clear that he expected that the very outside number of evicted tenants of all sorts who would have to be provided with new farms would not exceed 500 or 600. That being so, the hon. and learned Member had no right to get up and say that the situation had been changed, because the Nationalist Party most clearly showed by their action upon the Bill of 1903 that they meant the clauses therein contained should put an end to the evicted tenants question. Therefore he said that it was dishonest for them now to state the contrary. [Cries of "Oh."] Their action had throughout this matter been dishonest. [Cries of "Order, order," and "Withdraw."] They most distinctly stated their intentions, and on the strength of their statements the Bill of 1903 went through, it being fully intended that that measure should put an end to the question. No new situation had arisen to call for the interference of Parliament, and the hon. and learned Gentleman knew that more people had been reinstated than he ever thought of at all. On these grounds he thought the Nationalist Party was bound to oppose, as the Members for Ulster were opposing, this Bill. The Bill asked for powers in regard to tenanted land which, in his opinion, would create great hardship. The Attorney-General for Ireland said they could trust the Estates Commissioners, but they did not do so. At all events he did not do so. He objected to there being placed in their hands such extraordinary powers which were not given even to Judges in this country. He regretted very much that the right hon. Gentleman did not see his way to meet them in this respect. The question of permitting the Estates Commissioners to take tenanted land was probably the most important part of the Bill. No justification had been shown for it. The only argument the Chief Secretary had used was that the reinstatement of evicted tenants was not proceeding as fast as it ought. But more evicted tenants had actually been reinstated than were supposed to exist. He still hoped the Chief Secretary would either now or at a later stage remove the very strong feeling entertained by Irish Members against this particular clause and modify it in the direction they asked for.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 66; Noes, 257. (Division List, No. 289.)

AYES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Boyle, Sir Edward
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. H.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford)
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Moore, William
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John

Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boland, John
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.)
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Jackson, R. S.
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Joyce, Michael
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down. S,)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Mallet, Charles E.
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murray, James
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joesph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A, Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpn
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thorne, William
Toulmin, George

Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williamson, A.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Mr. J. F. MASON (Windsor) said the Amendment of which he had given notice was to insure that before compulsion was resorted to an honest attempt should be made to secure by agreement the objects the Government had in view. There was plenty of land in Ireland which could be bought—and bought in the locality in which it was required. But sellers, to be willing sellers, undoubtedly expected to get a fair price for their land and its equipments.

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL suggested that as he himself had an Amendment down at a later stage which raised the whole question perhaps his hon. friend would not move this Amendment and thus save time.

Mr. J. F. MASON did not proceed further with his Amendment.

*__Mr. ASHLEY__ (Lancashire, Blackpool), in moving to leave out the word "compulsorily," said that he would not repeat the arguments which he had used on his Amendment to leave out the Subsection (1). But he might say first of all that he objected to compulsion because it was a breach of faith with the landlords in reference to the compact arrived at in 1903. In the second place, the insertion of the word "compulsorily," in his opinion, was creating a dangerous precedent for the benefit of individuals and not for the benefit of the community as a whole. If the Committee thought they would settle the question by inserting the word "compulsorily," and allowing the Commissioners to take land where they liked and at what price they liked, for the sake of some two thousand tenants for whom 80,000 acres of land were to be provided at a cost of something like £2,000,000, all he could say was that they would by no means close the open sore of which the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary had spoken, and they would not bring any finality into the question. What did the Committee imagine that the other 5,400 tenants would do? These tenants had been excluded from any participation in the Act of 1903, and they were to be excluded from the benefits of the present Bill. Was it supposed that they would calmly sit down and not start a new agitation to be included within the scope of the Bill if it were passed into law? They knew perfectly well that there had been no finality in land legislation in Ireland. Yet they were deliberately passing an Act to include 3,000 heads of families and to exclude 5,400. The argument that compulsion would bring about finality would not hold water for a moment. The Committee ought to ask two questions: first, could this land be provided voluntarily, and, secondly, how many of these evicted tenants were they to provide for? On October 29th last year, when he was being questioned about the working of the Act of 1903 with regard to the evicted tenants, Mr. Bryce said—

> "He entirely denied that it could be fairly said that the Act had failed in dealing with the evicted tenants; not even substantially."

In the face of that statement it was surely a very serious request to make of the Committee that they should depart from the voluntary principle which Mr. Bryce said had worked so successfully, and pass a measure to confer on the Estates Commissioners compulsory powers to purchase land. He would ask the Committee to turn to Section 40 of the Report on the Irish Land Act, 1903, which had been presented lately to the House by the Chief Secretary who, in the course of his speech in introducing this Bill, had urged hon. Members to look at the Report, which he said contained most interesting and important information that would enable them to form an unbiassed and proper judgment on the merits of this question. He had noticed that Section 40 was carefully avoided by the hon. and learned Member for Waterford, but he had quoted No. 41, which he found in his favour. He must read this section to the House, for it was really of very considerable importance:—

> "Proceedings have been instituted by owners, and are at present pending for the sale to the Commissioners of about 80,000 acres of untenanted land offered under Sections 6, 7, and 8 of the Act, but the bulk of the land thus offered, if ultimately acquired, is needed for the enlargement of small holdings in the localities in which the land is situate, and the people of these localities would strongly object to the whole, or even a considerable portion, of the lands being set aside to meet the requirements of evicted tenants alone; nor is it probable that evicted tenants would be willing to take land at a distance from their former holdings, and in localities where their introduction would meet with local opposition. Moreover, the purchase of untenanted land under the powers given by the Act of 1903 is necessarily slow, inasmuch as it depends on the consent of the owner and proof of title to the purchase money."

They gathered from that paragraph that the Commissioners were within a reasonable distance of being in possession of 80,000 acres of untenanted land, the bulk of which was wanted for the tenants in the localities where the land was situated, in order to bring uneconomic holdings up to the level of economic holdings. Therefore, in the opinion of some people it was undesirable to allocate the land to evicted tenants, and, therefore again, the Government said that they must have compulsory powers to acquire land somewhere else. Mr. Bryce on 29th October of last year said—

> "The quantity of untenanted land is limited, especially in Ulster and Munster. Even in Connaught he believed there was not more than one-third of what would be wanted to raise all small uneconomic holdings to the level of reasonable economic holdings."

That was to say that only one-third of the land necessary to raise uneconomic holdings to economic holdings and make them of the proper size was available. Whether they put compulsion in the Bill or whether they did not, they could not make more land than there was; and the only course, he supposed, was that the Government would take the land for the evicted tenants which ought to go to increase the uneconomic holdings into economic holdings, and thus deprive the tenants of the locality who ought to have it.

MR. T. L. CORBETT called attention to the fact that there were not forty Members present.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN (Mr. CALDWELL) said there had recently been a division which showed the number of Members present, and it was not usual to count the House when a division had been recently taken, and the number of Members in the House had been thus ascertained.

MR. ASHLEY said he would like the right hon. Gentleman to explain how if there was only one-third of the land of a locality available to make uneconomic holdings into economic holdings, they were going to increase the amount of land available by this Bill? If what Mr. Bryce said was true, they would have to give a preference to the evicted tenants over the law-abiding tenants, and the land would be taken away from the law-abiding tenants and the new tenants—land, which if it was taken at all, ought to go to them. He thought he had successfully proved that as far as the land was available in Ireland, such land could be got without compulsion, and, therefore, as far as that was concerned, the word "compulsorily" was unnecessary. The second point was whether the House was bound to provide land for all the evicted tenants. He would go as far as to say that he would support a measure which would compulsorily take land on the Plan of Campaign estates in order to reinstate the evicted tenants there, and for this reason, that he considered that the people who had been evicted from those estates had been led astray by the persons who had given them bad advice. They had suffered seriously for their sins, while those who had given them bad advice had not been punished. He thought that those tenants had been punished sufficiently, and therefore ought to be reinstated, if necessary, compulsorily. But nobody would get up and say that it was necessary to bring in this complicated Bill in order to obtain compulsory powers to reinstate tenants on the Plan of Campaign estates. There were seventeen of those estates, of which fifteen had been disposed of, leaving only two to be dealt with, the

Clanricarde estate and the Lewis estate. On the Clanricarde estate he understood that there were 126 applications, and on the Lewis estate thirty-five, making a total of 161. He imagined that it would not be contended that the whole of the 161 were genuine claims, if they looked to the fact that out of 8,400 claims 5,400 had already been refused by the Commissioners. In 1893 there were only 900 evicted tenants on the whole of the Plan of Campaign estates, and 800 of them had since been reinstated. Under those circumstances he should have thought that compulsory powers would not have been necessary. The suggestion to confer compulsory powers ran counter to the opinion of three classes in Ireland—the landlords, the tenants who would be turned out, and, he could not but believe, the ordinary tenants also, by whom, in most districts, untenanted land was looked on as their heritage. He did not think any hon. Member would deny that in most parts of Ireland the present tenants considered that if the untenanted land was taken out of the hands of the landlords it ought to be applied to increasing the size of the uneconomic holdings. This measure was intended to do away with a long-standing sorrow, and in order to carry out this object they were creating a new hardship in respect of the ordinary tenants. The general trend of all policy up to the year 1903 with regard to Irish land legislation was that the landlords should be allowed to continue in occupation of their dwelling-houses, demesnes, and untenanted land, and that the tenants should be made owners as soon as possible. It was very necessary that sufficient land should be kept to allow tenants to enlarge their holdings. The Chief Secretary had tried to win their assent to these compulsory powers by dwelling on the deplorable condition of the crops in the west of Ireland. But the evicted tenants, poor people, had got no holdings or crops, and to urge them to pass compulsory powers for the reinstatement of the evicted tenants because the present tenants had bad crops was a false issue.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: Order, order! Obviously the hon. Member is making a second reading speech and he must confine himself to the Amendment.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL pointed out that at the special request of the Chairman his hon. friend had refrained from moving his Amendment, on the assurance that when this particular Amendment was reached the whole question could be gone into. [Cries of "No, no."] He made that statement without any fear of contradiction.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: It is not a question of discussing compulsion, but whether the discussion should be allowed to extend over the whole range of the Bill as if it were a Second Reading debate. If that were allowed, the discussion in Committee would be interminable. There is no objection whatever to discussing compulsion, and any arguments against granting compulsory powers will have the most unlimited scope, but not speeches of a Second Reading character.

MR. ASHLEY said the right hon. Gentleman had tried to induce the Committee to assent to this principle of compulsion by pointing out that the crops in the West of Ireland were in a very deplorable condition. Surely that had nothing to do with the case. It should not be forgotten that they were dealing in this case with tenants who had no crops, and consequently the right hon. Gentleman had raised a false issue. Why was this Bill brought in? The real reason was that it was a sop to hon. Members below the gangway. The Government found themselves in a difficulty. They forgot the Jarrow election and were prepared to do anything in order to obtain the support of hon. Members below the gangway. He strongly objected to this compulsory clause. It would do no good, and what was more it would do a great deal of harm by preventing that finality in this matter which they all wished to see. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 7, to leave out the word 'compulsorily.'"—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'compulsorily' stand part of the clause."

MR. CHERRY said he did not think the hon. Member would be at all surprised when he informed him that the

Government could not accept this Amendment. The hon. Member must be aware that these compulsory powers were the essence of the Bill. Indeed, the Bill would be almost unnecessary except for compulsion, as the Estates Commissioners under the Act of 1903 had considerable powers in regard to the acquisition of land. It had been found that the whole problem could not be dealt with satisfactorily without these compulsory powers. He might say, on behalf of the Government, that, of course, they did not intend that these powers should be put in force unless it was necessary, and they believed that by taking them they would facilitate and increase the opportunities of voluntary settlement. He thought the speech of the hon. Gentleman showed that he also was of opinion that these evicted tenants ought to be reinstated.

*Mr. ASHLEY: Only on the Plan of Campaign estates.

Mr. CHERRY said that, of course, compulsion was required to reinstate tenants on the Clanricarde estate. Owing to the attitude of Lord Clanricarde compulsion was necessary.

Mr. ASHLEY: Why did not the Government bring in a Bill to deal with Lord Clanricarde alone ?

Mr. CHERRY replied that he did not say that that was the only estate where compulsion was necessary. He believed there were other estates in that position. It would be a strange thing to pass a special Act of Parliament to deal with a particular estate. There was at present a very limited amount of land available. That amount of land would undoubtedly be increased if compulsory powers were provided. He was quite sure that if the Bill did anything it would increase the amount of land available for purchase, both voluntarily and compulsorily. The Government were quite satisfied that the Estates Commissioners, as sensible men, would not exercise these compulsory powers unnecessarily

Mr. T. L. CORBETT said that after the speech which the Attorney-General for Ireland had just delivered, it was not surprising that not a single supporter of the Government sat behind him. The Chief Secretary and the Attorney-General were left alone to defend their forlorn cause so far as Ireland was concerned. Their followers trusted rather to the big battalions that flocked in when the division bells rang than to arguments addressed them in the course of debate. So far as the word "compulsion" was concerned, he was not afraid of it. He had himself voted, in the last Parliament, for compulsory purchase, and in doing so he voted against his own Party. But what were the conditions of compulsory purchase in the Bill ? The Government proposed to apply compulsion for the benefit of men who had not kept their contracts, nor paid rent, at the expense of those who had. He regretted the remarks of the Attorney-General about his absolute want of sympathy with those who fulfilled their contracts, and acted like honest men. The Bill, in his opinion and that of his friends, was a deliberate attempt to subsidise the dishonest at the expense of the honest. It ought to be called not an Evicted Tenants Bill, but a Convicted Tenants Bill. They all, he was sure, pitied these unfortunate tenants, mostly belonging to a very ignorant class who were the dupes and victims of the United Irish League, and of those who ought to know better; and still more they pitied their wives and children. He often wondered why these wounded soldiers of the land war did not benefit more from the Nationalist war chest. He could not help thinking that it was very unjust that the principle of compulsion should be applied at the expense of honest—he was speaking of men he represented in the North of Ireland—at the expense of honest, rent-paying—[A Nationalist Member: "God-fearing."]—yes, God-fearing men. He was not ashamed of the phrase "God-fearing." The evicted tenants had been led into breaking the law through ignorance, and they were the dupes and victims of the unfortunate campaign which was carried on in Ireland. Although a strong advocate of compulsory purchase and one who had always voted for it, he was not prepared to apply that principle on behalf of dishonest men who had not done their duty, at the expense of honest men who had.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said it was evident that this was perhaps the most important Amendment which would be submitted. That fact was appreciated by the Chairman, who had stated that he did not propose to limit the discussion seeing that the essence of the Bill was to be found in the compulsory proposals.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN (Mr. CALDWELL): Of course, the discussion must necessarily be limited to the Amendment. If the essence of the Bill is to be found in the compulsory powers, the principle of compulsion will have been affirmed by the House on the Second Reading.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said there was, of course, a limit to everything. He was speaking of reasonable discussion, and he proposed to deal with the subject on those lines. He was interested and amused at the statement of the Attorney-General that he was quite prepared to entrust this matter to the discretion of the Estates Commissioners. He was not enamoured of that body. He was in a position to know the opinion of one class of the community in Ireland as to the way in which they had been treated by the Estates Commissioners. He did not profess to know who was to blame, but he could tell the Chief Secretary that throughout the length and breadth of Ireland every landlord believed that he had not been justly treated by the Estates Commissioners.

MR. BIRRELL: Every one?

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said he had not met one in the last three years who thought he had been fairly treated. In almost every part of Ireland the landlords complained that the powers of the Estates Commissioners, under the Act of 1903, had been grossly abused to their injustice. He did not know whether the landlords were right in that or not, but that was the universal opinion of the landlord class. The Committee were asked to leave this to the discretion of the Estates Commissioners. The Attorney-General had mentioned by way of illustration the case of a railway company empowered to acquire land compulsorily, and stated that if they could act by agreement they did not enforce their compulsory powers. But the right hon. Gentleman forgot to state that the railway company did not fix the price under their compulsory powers. In this case he had to deal with the Bill as he found it. He could not anticipate that the monstrous provisions which enabled the Estates Commissioners to be the judges in their own cause were going to be amended. Up to the present he had seen no indication of a temper to amend the Bill in any shape or form, to make it work justly and harmoniously. It was ludicrous to talk of putting confidence in the Estates Commissioners when they were to be the purchasers and to fix their own price. There was to be no appeal from them. They were to be placed in a position under Act of Parliament which no other body occupied in this or any other civilised country. He challenged right hon. Gentlemen opposite to quote a single case in which Parliament had ever sanctioned the exercise of compulsory powers by a public body who were themselves to fix the price, and from whose decision as to the amount there was to be no appeal. No such a case could be found.

AN HON. MEMBER: It was in the Act of 1903.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said the hon. Member was talking of a different thing altogether; he was talking of a case in which Parliament under certain conditions provided that where three-fourths of the tenants of a property wanted to purchase, those three-fourths were to override the one-fourth. Did anyone pretend that that was an analogy or had any resemblance to the gross and extraordinary injustice that this Bill would perpetrate by appointing those gentlemen who it was asserted, rightly or wrongly, had forfeited the confidence of the entire community for whom they had to administer this code? Whoever was to blame, the fact was—and he challenged contradiction—that throughout the length and breadth of Ireland the landlords had ceased to have any confidence in the majority of the Estates Commissioners. That being so, could anything be more grossly unjust? It was a ludicrous suggestion to say that the difficulties and the injustice of the Bill were no worse and no greater than Parliament perpetrated when it conferred on railway or other companies the power to acquire land compulsorily. In every such Act of Parliament of which he knew, the railway company had to go before an arbitrator, and if the owner of the land was not satisfied with what the arbitrator gave him he could appeal and have that decision tested elsewhere; but in this extraordinary Bill—the outcome of terror, of fright, of a desire to survive the effects of the recent convention in Ireland—for the first time in the history of legislation in this country, it was proposed to hand over the right to deal with other people's property to a public body who were themselves to fix the price they would give, and as to whose decisions, either as to compensation or any question of fact, there was to be absolutely no appeal. That was the first respect in which the compulsory powers of this Bill would operate with the greatest injustice, but there was another very important respect in which they would have the same result, and that was as regarded the purchasing tenants under the Land Purchase Act of 1903. All over Ireland, on the part of landlords and tenants alike, there was bitter complaint against the delays in the office of the Estates Commissioners. It might be that that was in part due to the fact that they had never been able to get the staff from the State that they asked for, and it was also due to a large extent to the amount of red tape with which the Department was bound up; but whatever the cause, there had been for the last two years bitter complaints on the part of tenants as well as of landlords, as to the delay. Hon. Members below the gangway knew perfectly well that after a tenant had signed an agreement to purchase his holding he was subject to interest. That interest was less than his rent, but more than his annuity would be thereafter. And every day of delay in the payment of the purchase money he was paying in the shape of interest a heavier rent than he would have to pay if the transaction was concluded in good time. What would be the effect of taking away the Estates Commissioners from their ordinary duties under the Land Purchase Act and devoting them to the compulsory acquisition of land for the purpose of restoring a number of evicted tenants? What was the justification for it? Would anyone who was in that House in 1903 or had read the debates in that year say that Parliament ever contemplated that the evicted tenants question was to be put in the forefront to the prejudice of the ordinary purchasing tenant? The thing was ludicrous. The question of evicted tenants was only incidental. If it was contended that the main purpose of the Land Purchase Act of 1903 was the restoration of the evicted tenants, all he could say was that there was not a word of it in 1903. He quite agreed that it was the common opinion on all sides of the House that in carrying out that great measure for the transfer of land from the landlord to the tenant, it was eminently desirable that at the same time this burning question of the evicted tenants should be dealt with, but no one suggested in the course of that debate that the evicted tenants question was the first thing to be settled. On the contrary, everyone had then the cry, "Settle the purchasing tenants, get rid of landlordism, hurry up the matter and transfer the landlord's property to the tenants, and convert them into owners." Those purchasing tenants were to remain under these annuities for a year or two years more while this process was going on for the restoration of the evicted tenants. The right hon. Member for Dover had read a statement of his views on the objects and principles of his measure, and it was there distinctly stated that no preference was to be given in the administration of that Act to the evicted tenants or any other class, and that was agreed to; but it was not to be wondered at that that argument had little effect on hon. Gentlemen opposite, because already in an earlier period of this session they distinctly gave their blessing to a legislative attempt to repudiate and destroy everything that formed the common ground of the legislative contract of 1903. They gave their blessing to a Land Bill which proposed to do away with the owners and to apply compulsion to every landlord in Ireland. Therefore this was a small morsel for them to swallow when their digestion was equal to the other measure. Let them not labour to find excuses for introducing compulsion for 2,000 evicted tenants, when already in the course of this session they had given their approval to a proposition to apply compulsion all round. One could understand the more extreme of the Party represented by the right hon. Gentleman opposite going in for compulsion; but what he could not understand, and of which he had heard no suggested explanation, was why, when they went out of their way to adopt the principle of compulsion here, they had gone out of their way to hand over this work to public officials, who were to fix their own price and from whose decision there was to be no appeal. It might be what was called good business, but he called it dishonesty and injustice. Another objection to the compulsory powers contained in the Bill was to be found in the fact that no real case had been made out for them. He would like to know where this Bill came from. They heard nothing of it in the King's Speech; they did have a reference to some Bills for Ireland, but they had heard nothing of it since. That had gone into the limbo of unredeemed pledges, which were so numerous with hon. Gentlemen opposite that they would have to enlarge their premises, but this Bill, of which they had heard nothing up to a few months ago, suddenly appeared after the hon. and learned Member for Waterford had announced at the Irish National Convention that he was practically going to take the Chief Secretary by the throat.

Mr. BIRRELL: This Bill is a direct outcome of a pledge given by me in my place in this House long long before the Irish Council Bill was brought in.

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL said that so far as the right hon. Gentleman was concerned, he completely accepted that, but still there was a difficulty. If that were so, it was difficult to explain why it was brought at such a late stage of the session.

*The DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN called the right hon. Gentleman to order, saying that he must confine himself to the question of compulsory powers, th subject-matter of the Amendment.

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL said he wanted to trace the origin of the introduction of compulsory powers.

*The DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN again called the right hon. Gentleman to order. He was discussing the history of the Bill, and not the special subject of the Amendment.

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL said that with regard to the necessity for this Bill and its compulsory powers, he would like to remind the Committee once more of a matter which they might have lost sight of, and that was how the figures stood as to the evicted tenants. Under the Plan of Campaign started in 1886 there were 114 cases. In the year 1894, when the Mathew Commission reported, they found that out of those 114 cases only seventeen remained unsettled. In 1904 the Commissioners reported that the evicted tenants had been restored in every case except two, one of these being the Lewis estate, in regard to which the Commissioners reported that the owners would not come to terms. These facts showed the injustice of bringing in a Bill of this kind, because the only question between the Lewis people and the Estates Commissioners was a question of price, and he asked hon. Members, to whatever Party they belonged, whether, when there was a controversy between the Estates Commissioners and the proprietors of the Lewis estate as to price, that question should be left to be decided by one party, namely, the Estates Commissioners, and that that decision should be without appeal. He did not think that anybody would defend such a policy as that. Supposing the Commissioners thought that the price should be £500, while the owners wanted £1,000, was the whole matter to be entrusted to three Commissioners who wanted to get the estate for £500? It could not be argued that that was a proper course to secure justice or fair play. In regard to the evicted tenants under the Plan of Campaign, as he had said, all the cases had been dealt with except two. [Cries of "No."] He said "Yes," and at all events the Estates

Commissioners themselves said that there were only two Plan of Campaign estates in regard to which evicted tenants had not been restored. [Renewed cries of "No."] It was true that they said so. He did not himself know whether the statement was true or not, but the Commissioners stated in the most explicit terms that there were only two estates on which the evicted tenants had not been restored, and in the Lewis case it was only a question of pounds, shillings and pence, and his contention was that the question should not be left to the decision of one of the parties to the dispute. That did not seem to him to be a proper thing in the way of justice and fair play. He would like to refer to the suggestion that previous legislation compelled Irish landlords to sell their land at a price to which they did not assent. In the case of the Land Act of 1881, although the tenant could come into Court and get a fair rent fixed, still there was always an appeal. There was an appeal from the Sub-Commissioner to the Chief Commissioner, and then to the Land Commissioners as a whole, and finally to the Law Courts. The extraordinary injustice of this Bill was that there was no appeal anywhere from the decision of the Commissioners. He was not going to anticipate the discussion as to the necessity of an appeal, but when that debate did come on he should point out to the right hon. Gentleman that he was a little premature in saying that there was an appeal in regard to these compulsory terms. The right hon. Gentleman had twitted him and said that his argument on this question was rather inconsistent, because he had previously stated that he was not opposed to the principle of compulsion if properly protected and where everything else had failed. What he said was that he was not opposed to the principle of compulsion if everything else had been tried and failed and the landlords upon whom they proposed to try compulsion had refused a reasonable and proper offer. But he said that any such compulsion to recommend itself to him should be safeguarded by a proper appeal to a proper tribunal. Subject to those conditions, he admitted that he would not have opposed a Bill drawn upon proper lines and giving protection to the landlords. In regard to the finance of the Bill, he believed that for one-third of the money which the Treasury were willing to give ten times the amount of untenanted land required could be purchased in Ireland. He wondered if the House knew what was the amount of money to be expended under this Bill. It would far exceed anything which a voluntary measure would have required. They had had some light thrown on the question as to what was the real object of the Bill with its compulsory powers, because the Attorney-General for Ireland had told them that what he hoped would be accomplished by it was that the new tenants who were the centres of disturbance in their localities would be compulsorily expropriated. He had had a long and probably a more varied experience of Ireland than the right hon. Gentleman, and he could tell him that the man who was the centre of disturbance was sure to be the man who had the greatest stake in his farm, and had done more for it than his neighbours had for theirs. The evicted tenants looked upon a man of that character as a centre of disturbance, and because he was most difficult to get rid of the chief law officer stood up in his place and said that the great virtue of the Bill was that it would enable them to turn these men out of their holdings compulsorily, because they had resisted intimidation and illegality and had become the centres of disturbance in their localities. What was to become of these centres of disturbance? Where was the right hon. Gentleman going to send them? Would they be any happier in the new holdings to which they were sent? Would they cease to be centres of disturbance? He had heard the hon. and learned Gentleman's utterances with the greatest regret. He could not conceive anything more fatal to the administration of the law or more likely to leave it in a state of paralysis than for the first law officer of the Crown to get up in his place in the House of Commons and say he approved of the compulsory powers under the Bill, because they would enable the Government to get rid of individuals who had become centres of disturbance in their own districts.

MR. CHERRY: I said nothing of the kind.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said he was only repeating what he and most hon. Members on that side understood the Attorney-General to say He certainly said that the compulsory powers under the Bill would be most useful, because in many parts of Ireland they had to protect with police some of the new tenants, who by their presence were centres of disorder, and that by transferring these people to other holdings they would get rid of the disturbance of such districts, and save the expense of providing protection. A more extraordinary statement by a law officer of the Crown he could not conceive. If the Chief Secretary had satisfied himself that compulsory powers were required, and had come forward with proposals which would give to landlord and tenant the fullest and fairest compensation for their property, and prevent injustice to the new tenant who desired to stay on, and if it had been shown that such a measure was desirable in the interests of peace and order, he would have supported it, though he might not have liked it; but he had seen no indication of concession on the part of the Chief Secretary or his colleagues, and he was convinced that the Bill as it stood would settle nothing, but unsettle everything, and create in every part of Ireland new centres of disaffection and new sources of intimidation.

MR. BIRRELL said the right hon. and learned Gentleman had an extraordinary way of conducting arguments on the Committee Stage of a Bill. Every time he spoke he ranged over the entire field, and introduced all his objections to the Bill as a whole. The Amendment was to leave out the word "compulsorily." The right hon. and learned Gentleman had said that if some appeal were given and the Estates Commissioners subjected to more control his violent opposition to the Bill would be appeased.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL: And also proper provisions for securing compensation and full protection to the new tenants.

MR. BIRRELL said they had not come to that yet. He was under no obligation to state what they were going to do with subsequent Amendments. He would deal with these questions as they arose, after hearing the arguments brought forward. All they were dealing with at present was whether land should be taken compulsorily. The right hon. Gentleman had distinguished himself from those sitting near him by assailing the character and independence of the Estates Commissioners, and in doing so had claimed to speak for every landlord in Ireland. He could not do anything of the kind. He spoke of professional experience, but he had not been the advocate of every landlord in the country. The right hon. and learned Gentleman had said that the three Estates Commissioners were to be judges in their own cause. Was Mr. Bailey an evicted tenant? Did Mr. Finucane desire fifteen acres of bog near Athenry instead of his house in Dublin? If he were to borrow from the vocabulary of the right hon. Gentleman he would say that his statement was dishonest. [Cries of "Order."] These three gentlemen had no personal interest. A railway company had to acquire land as cheaply as possible for the benefit of their undertaking, but the Estates Commissioners put no money in their pocket.

MR. ASHLEY asked if it was in order to call the statement of his right hon. friend dishonest.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL: I do not object.

*MR. BIRRELL said the right hon. Gentleman had used very strong language about the Bill. He had only said that if he had the right hon. Gentleman's vocabulary he should have used certain words. Such language as the right hon. Gentleman had used was improper as applied to the Estates Commissioners, who had no personal interest in the matter, though as public men they might be found to have assisted in the settlement of a great question. To say that the Estates Commissioners were judges in their own cause was not in accordance with the facts of the case. The Commissioners had no more interest in the matter than

Judge Ross would have. Suppose an appeal was given, would the Judge to whom the appeal was given be a judge in his own cause? Yet he would be just as much an officer under the Bill as the Estates Commissioners. As to compulsion the Commissioners certainly had land in their possession, but it was needed to turn uneconomic holdings into economic holdings, and that object could not be postponed to reinstate evicted tenants. It was common ground, he understood, that the evicted tenants should be reinstated, and in order that this should be done in reasonable time, and having regard to the number of landlords who had refused inspection surely all would admit that some measure of compulsion was required. That at all events was the only question at the moment, and he must say that, considering the purposes to which compulsion had been applied by Acts of Parliament without demur, though he agreed under somewhat different circumstances and different provisions, like those of the Lands Clauses Acts, and the like, there was ground for the proposal of the Bill. It was not a question of applying compulsion to a twopenny ha'penny railway. [Cries of "Oh!"] Some of these railways had never paid the shareholders a penny. People had been turned out of their houses and obliged to give up places where their families had lived for centuries, in order that there might be made a railway which proved a failure, until, perhaps some large company came to the neighbourhood and assumed charge of it. He was assuming that this was a worthy and proper motive, which all of them had at heart. But if these tenants were to be regarded as a set of rogues, why were they put into the Act of 1903 even voluntarily? The evicted tenants fell within the scope and purview of that Act, and certainly the compact would never have been carried through if it had not been put in the forefront of the argument of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover, who at all events was prepared to let bygones be bygones, and to include these persons in the scope of the Bill. That was common ground and he had thought that it was still common ground. The Government were satisfied that it was impossible to bring this matter to a conclusion without taking compulsorily powers, very rarely, he dared say, to be exercised, but still to enable the Estate Commissioners to proceed with those landlords on the footing that if they would not come to terms they could be made to do so. That would clear the ground and enable them to come to a conclusion on the question in a reasonable time. The Government were therefore right in resisting this Amendment, and in conferring on the Estates Commissioners the power to take land compulsorily for a purpose which all parties in that House considered a good object, namely, the restoration of the evicted tenants.

MR. MOORE said the right hon. Gentleman had unintentionally confused the issue. They were not considering whether the evicted tenants should be reinstated, because all parties in the House had entered into a bargain that they should be, and there had never been any suggestion from those benches against the terms of that bargain. It was in pursuance of that that land of an estate was to be offered for purchase.

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Amendment had reference to the compulsory acquisition of land for evicted tenants.

MR. MOORE said he was replying to the right hon. Gentleman, who had said that Members on his side had abandoned the compact of 1903. He thought it necessary to answer that in the way of an absolute denial.

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said he had allowed the reference by the right hon. Gentleman, but he thought it was not in order, and ought not to be pursued.

MR. MOORE said he desired to register a denial of the statement made by the right hon. Gentleman that they were abandoning the bargain. Another attempt had been made to confuse the issue, on the false analogy drawn between compulsory powers conferred for various purposes and the compulsory powers to be conferred on the Estates Commissioners. In the case of a railway company or other undertaking where they sought to acquire land compulsorily, their operations were confined to a limited area, and the first question which a Committee upstairs asked was, "What is the line of your deviation ?" But in the case of the Estates Commissioners the compulsory powers to be conferred would enable them to go all over Ireland to see what land they could get for the evicted tenants. The whole gist of the matter was that they were giving the Commissioners a power of discrimination between the loyal tenant and the disloyal tenant, between the man who was unpopular because he had done or had tried to do his duty, and the United Irish League, whose business it was to make him unpopular. Compulsory powers were to be exercised according to the discrimination of the Commissioners, who were not a judicial but an administrative body, and were the faithful and devoted servants of the Government. Under the Bill, when it came to the question of compulsory powers, the Government were making of these Commissioners devoted and loyal partisans to carry out administrative duties under the control of the Government and of the Chief Secretary.

Mr. BIRRELL : When have I ever attempted to interfere with them ?

Mr. MOORE said the right hon. Gentleman might have delegated his duties to the Under-Secretary. [Cries of "Oh."] He did not know what the right hon. Gentleman might have done. He assumed that the regulations as to intimidation were altered after consultations with the right hon. Gentleman or his predecessor, or perhaps after consultation with the Under-Secretary. But what he wished to say was that the Commissioners were to be judges in their own cause. They fixed the price of the land, because they were not allowed, as the Vice-President of the Board of Agriculture had said, to re-sell it at a loss. The Chief Secretary had referred to them as "public trustees," without any personal interest ; but they would be quickly reprimanded by the Treasury every time they sold land at a loss. He submitted that they would undervalue land because they were not allowed to re-sell at a loss, and because they were under the statutory liability not to re-sell at a loss. Yet the right hon. Gentleman said that the Commissioners were public trustees though they had this statutory liability hanging round their neck, binding all their actions. The powers put into the hands of these Commissioners would destroy public confidence in the tribunal. This Bill was drafted with the approval of the Estates Commissioners.

Mr. BIRRELL : They had nothing whatever to do with the drafting of this Bill.

Mr. MOORE : May I ask whether it was submitted to them before it was introduced, and, if so, whether they approved of it ?

Mr. BIRRELL : When the Bill was finally drafted it was submitted to them for any suggestions they might like to make upon it.

Mr. MOORE : I understand they were asked to approve of it in the form in which it was introduced.

Mr. BIRRELL : They were not asked to approve of it ; they were simply asked if they had any suggestions to offer.

Mr. MOORE : It appears to be painful to the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. BIRRELL : Not at all.

Mr. MOORE, continuing, said the Bill, as drawn, gave no appeal from the Commissioners, nor any suggestion that there should be an appeal. He would tell the right hon. Gentleman frankly that to invest these people with compulsory powers to purchase was a proposal which did not lend itself either to a sense of fair play or to the peace of Ireland, and certainly would not add to public confidence in the new tribunal.

Mr. BARRIE said he knew the agricultural parts of Ireland very well, and he had no hesitation in saying that the voluntary provisions of the Act of 1903 with regard to evicted tenants had been a success. Under the voluntary powers of that Act a large number of tenants had been reinstated. He thought that disposed of that side of the matter.

If compulsion were necessary, he would like to know on what grounds the evicted tenants should have priority of treatment. Like the hon. Member for North Down, he was in favour of a final solution of the land difficulty on the lines of compulsory purchase, if it was found that after an adequate trial of the Act of 1903 a substantial number of landlords refused to come to terms. He had not yet heard any reasons given why rent-paying, peaceful tenant farmers of Ireland should be treated differently from the so-called evicted tenants. Had the Chief Secretary realised what the effect of the Bill would be if the Estates Commissioners proceeded to evict the present occupants of farms, and replace them by evicted tenants? Had he realised the effect on a large estate in the South of Ireland, where the bulk of the tenants had fulfilled their moral obligations, and refused to obey the orders of the United Irish League? Why should the evicted tenants be pampered by this Government in spite of past records, while honest men were to be removed from their farms? The evicted tenants were not only to be reinstated, but also to have large contributions from the Radical Treasury to start their farms, and bring them up to modern requirements. What was the effect of that policy to be on the surrounding tenants who, under adverse circumstances and after great struggles, had managed to fulfil all their obligations? The comparisons with English tenants which had been made could hardly be used as a fair argument in favour of the compulsion which this Bill proposed to set up. Personally he had no knowledge of the Estates Commissioners, and was not prepared to criticise any action they had taken, but in a matter affecting 2,000 tenants, he thought the landlords ought to have the right of appeal. He thought that after what had transpired in the debate, to retain those Commissioners absolutely independent as regarded any appeal from their decision was a course which the right hon. Gentleman would not find tenable. He felt that as the Bill proceeded through Committee the Chief Secretary would discover that, after all, there was a good deal to be said for the rent-paying, peaceful citizens, who had been no trouble at all to the Chief Secretary, and did not belong to that party in Ireland which had given the Irish Government so much concern.

Mr. J. F. MASON said the necessity for compulsion arose from the price that was offered for the land. The Estates Commissioners had frequently failed to come to a satisfactory arrangement with a landlord for the voluntary purchase of a farm because they had not been in a position to pay a fair price. If they insisted upon buying below a fair price compulsion became necessary. He could quote many cases in Ireland where land had been acquired compulsorily at a price far below the market value. If the object of the Bill was to acquire land by compulsion at less than its proper value then it was simply partial confiscation, and he did not think it was the intention of the Chief Secretary to apply the principle of confiscation. There was no necessity for compulsion at all in the matter, because there was plenty of land to be bought for the purposes of the Bill in the localities in which it was required. The Bill provided that the new tenants who were to be evicted were either to be supplied with farms of equal value or to receive money compensation. The right hon. Gentleman, however, said that many of them were bad farmers and had deteriorated the soil; if so, why plant them on new farms, where they could go on deteriorating the soil?

*The CHAIRMAN: That is a subject which would be better dealt with on Subsection (3) and not on this Amendment.

Mr. J. F. MASON said that the adoption of any method that would avoid compulsion, which was really in the nature of partial confiscation, would remove their objection to this proposal.

*Sir F. BANBURY denied that there was any analogy between the compulsory powers of railway companies and the compulsory powers under this Bill, as the right hon. Gentleman seemed to suggest. Parliament did not give a roving commission to railway directors to take land compulsorily anywhere, in any part of the country. It was most objectionable to grant compulsory powers for the benefit of one particular class, and one which had repudiated its engagements. The compulsory powers in this Bill were being given not in the interests of the whole community, but in the interests of one particular class. That argument alone, in his opinion, was conclusive against the proposal. The Chief Secretary said that railway companies who had exercised compulsory powers were often unable to pay interest on their debentures and preferences. The result was that the shareholders lost because they had compensated so generously those whose lands they took. But he would point out that the people for whose benefit the compulsory powers were given, namely, the people of England at large, never lost at all. They benefited. There was no termination for a railway enterprise; it always went on, and it could not be wound up. When compulsory powers were given to railway companies the public always reaped the main advantage, but the right hon. Gentleman now asked Parliament to give compulsory powers for the benefit of one class, and that a class which was less deserving than others. It was a class which had repudiated its engagements, and that, to his mind, was one of the worst things which could be done. For these reasons alone they ought not to grant the compulsory powers. The chief reason, to his mind, against granting these powers was that they were to be granted to an irresponsible body. It was not proposed that the compulsory powers were to be exercised only on certain estates; the Estates Commissioners were to be given a roving commission to go all over Ireland and exercise the compulsory powers where they liked. He ventured to say that such powers had never before been given in the history of England or of any other country. It was proposed to set up three dictators who were to be enabled to take away from other people property which they had acquired honestly and justly. He was surprised that the Chief Secretary should have supported his argument by referring to the compulsory powers granted to railway companies. It seemed to him that the right hon. Gentleman had used that illustration because he was hard up for arguments to justify this particular portion of the Bill, but he would admit in his quieter moments that it was not apposite to the point at issue. He hoped that those on that side of the House who had some regard for freedom and individual liberty would support the Amendment.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) said he frankly approached this question with an absolute hatred of compulsion, because it was nearly always iniquitous and pernicious in its consequences, and, in the present relation, was destructive of security and confidence. He wanted to know whether it was not in Ireland, as in England, Scotland, and Wales, of very great importance, not only to agriculturists, but to the whole community, that there should be as great a feeling of confidence and security as could possibly be given by the State, and by all the action the State might take. Under this Bill, without the Amendment, they would do their level best to destroy confidence and security. It was on the feeling of confidence and security that men spent their money, and he presumed the same conditions held good in Ireland as elsewhere. Was it not desirable that the owner of land should have a sense of security in his home, and an interest in the countryside? He asked the Chief Secretary to suppose himself in the position of an earnest and well-intentioned farmer in Ireland who occupied a farm which had not been properly cultivated by a disreputable predecessor, and who had applied his intellectual ability and talents to the development of the resources of the farm. Having developed the farm so far, he saw how he could develop it further, but he knew that suddenly he might, under this Bill, find himself in the position of having, without any warning and by the arbitrary action of a tribunal for which he would have no respect if he were in any other place than that of Chief Secretary, to vacate his holding, with the result that his work would become nugatory and his prospects would be destroyed. He asked the right hon. Gentleman whether, if he were in that position, he would spend a single farthing on the holding. The right hon. Gentleman would reply that nothing would induce him to do so foolish a thing. That was what he would say in his private capacity, but that was the position in which he was going to put hundreds, probably thousands, of tenants in Ireland. That was not business. It was not fair play. Had the right hon. Gentleman no feeling, he would not say of compassion, but of fair play for the landlords in regard to the position in which he was placing them by this Bill? He had been the fortunate guest in many a happy home in Ireland, and he wondered whether it was not necessary there, as here, for the benefit and welfare of the countryside, that the owners of property should be encouraged to feel some sort of security in their residences or homes, or in the possibility of developing their homes or of making their homes attractive to themselves and to those who came after them. What did the right hon. Gentleman do in that case? He asked the owner of land to get out; he reduced the value of his land by the action of the Bill; he took away from the owner the inducement to spend; he made him a temporary instead of a permanent possessor; and if he knew anything at all about rural life, he would recognise that in thus diminishing the hold of the owner on his home and his interest in his tenantry, he was doing the worst possible turn to agriculture and to the national and local life of the country. He asked the right hon. Gentleman to look at the effect of this measure, without the Amendment, first of all upon the position of the occupier of land, who was liable to be evicted; and secondly, upon the position of the owner of land, who was liable to have his property mutilated, and to have foisted upon him the very type of tenant he did not wish to have, and possibly the very type of man from whom he had had good reason to dread outrage and intimidation in the days gone by. Did he think that that would tend either to maintain the value of the property or residence or the likelihood that the owner would spend increased money there? The right hon. Gentleman had in warm language proclaimed that he would have nothing to do with confiscation, that if there was confiscation in this Bill it would have no support from him. But if by the action of the Bill they sent down the value of the residences of country gentlemen in Ireland, were they or were they not confiscating their property? The right hon. Gentleman knew very well he was confiscating property; he was doing so just as effectually as if he took so much of a man's bank balance or from his credit. There was no way out of that argument but for the right hon. Gentleman to say honestly, "I do confiscate his property, I do diminish his price for selling it, I do diminish his pleasures; and why? Because I am obeying the behest of a certain political party."

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said that the Chief Secretary in introducing this Bill had done more to put off that happy day to which everybody in Ireland was looking forward, when the whole Irish land question would be finally settled, than by any other means he could possibly adopt. The settlement of the evicted tenants question, together with the settlement of the larger question of the conversion of the tenants of Ireland into owners, had been going on since the passage of the Act of 1903 in a perfectly satisfactory manner, the only thing which had militated against a more rapid working of that Act having been the scarcity of money. The Chief Secretary came to Ireland knowing, as he had admitted on more than one occasion, practically nothing about the country, and the very first thing he did was to introduce a Bill which, as he hoped he would be able to show, was absolutely unnecessary, and would have the very opposite effect to that which the right hon. Gentleman desired—that of settling the evicted tenants question. The compulsion in this matter was a distinct application of breach of faith by every Party in the House of Commons who supported it. He supposed that one Liberal Party was more or less bound by the pledges or actions of the Liberal Party which preceded it, and the previous Liberal Party acquiesced in and gave their consent to the Act of 1903 in the most unqualified way. On the Third Reading of the Bill of 1903 there were only twenty-three dissentients, and that Bill stated in the most explicit terms that the reinstatement of evicted tenants was to be carried out by voluntary means, and by voluntary means alone, and it was most distinctly laid down that under no circumstances was compulsion to be applied. What, then, were they to think of the action of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, who was a lineal descendant of the late Liberal Party in the last House of Commons, and of the Party below the gangway, who to all intents and purposes represented the same interests as in the last House of Commons? He submitted that the reinstatement of the evicted tenants had been going on in the most satisfactory manner and as rapidly as could be expected. They had had no argument from the Chief Secretary in favour of the application of compulsion except that in his opinion the question was not being disposed of with sufficient rapidity. He submitted that that was not a sufficient argument for the House to pass such an extraordinary and drastic measure as the Bill now before them. The right hon. Gentleman had over and over again told them that he was new to Ireland, and certainly when he first declared his intention of introducing an evicted tenants Bill he admitted that he knew practically nothing about Ireland or of this question, yet they had this God-sent legislator going over to Ireland, knowing nothing about their requirements, and introducing a Bill which could have but one effect if this compulsory principle was applied. The report of the Estates Commissioners said that of the 1,609 cases in which applicants were considered suitable to be provided with their former holdings, 1,259 holdings were in the possession of other tenants. Let them think what a vista of discord and a re-opening of this whole question that held out before them. The whole 2,000 tenants that they were dealing with were going to be turned out of their holdings. If the right hon. Gentleman was doing away with the grievances of one set of tenants he was creating hardship in the case of another set of tenants. Did the right hon. Gentleman think that the new tenants or hon. Members of that House who defended these new tenants were going to take it "lying down"? More than one half of the cases of evicted tenants in the whole of Ireland had been settled, and if the question had been left alone the whole of them would have been settled in five years. The right hon. Gentleman said that that was too long a period to wait, but he (Mr. Craig) did not think so in regard to some of the tenants. He quite agreed that the evicted tenants under the Plan of Campaign should be restored to their holdings, but as matters now stood 90 per cent. of them had been reinstated. That was to say, 90 per cent. of those who had lost their farms for political reasons had been reinstated, and they were now dealing with only 10 per cent. of those tenants. Of the 8,500 evicted tenants there, the remainder were men who had lost their farms through other than political causes, such causes being drunkenness, laziness, incompetency, incapacity, and other reasons which led people to lose their businesses in every position in life, in every country in the world. The right hon. Gentleman said that in order to cure this great sore in Ireland compulsion must be applied, but the true and only reason why the Bill was being forced through was that the Irish Council Bill was rejected by hon. Gentlemen below the gangway.

THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that the remarks of the hon. Gentleman were out of order. He could hardly on this Amendment go into the question of the Irish Council Bill.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG agreed that perhaps that was a Second Reading point, but he thought he was right in showing the motives which had actuated the right hon. Gentleman to introduce such an incomplete measure. It was said that the Estates Commissioners could not get any more land. The only information they had on that point was contained in the Report of the Commissioners, which showed that they had made no determined attempt to obtain more land from the landlords. They said that they had applied to 1,752 landlords, and only 262 had expressed a willingness to sell. But they had had no statement from the Attorney-General for Ireland as to the steps the Estates Commissioners had taken to induce those people to sell. They had had a statement as to the steps which had been taken in regard to the reinstatement of evicted tenants, and if they read this Report they would not be surprised that the landlords had not given a favourable reply to the letter of the Estates Commissioners, because it was written in such a dictatorial and arbitrary tone that the landlords, as any other class of people to whom such a communication had been addressed would have done, disregarded it. The Commissioners commented upon the unwillingness of the landlords to sell, but they assumed that unwillingness from the want of replies to their letter. He thought the letter attempted to apply a form of compulsion to the landlord, and taking that into account, and the amount of dependence of the officials responsible for the Government of Ireland on hon. Members below the gangway, he had very little hope as to the Amendment of the Bill in that respect; but he prophesied with a considerable amount of certainty that instead of bringing the question of the evicted tenants and the land question generally to an end it would do more to retard that consummation than anything that had happened for a considerable number of years.

MR. WALTER LONG said he was rather surprised that nobody had risen from the bench opposite to justify the adoption of this Bill with its rather extraordinary compulsory powers. The Chief Secretary in the speech in which he defended his action upon the Report of the Estates Commissioners had expressed his regret that attacks should be made upon those gentlemen, and the Vice-President of the Irish Department of Agriculture also made a very indignant speech upon the subject. No one was more responsible for the attacks on the Estates Commissioners of which he complained than the Chief Secretary himself, because he had stated that in their Report was to be found the justification for compulsion. It was proposed by the Bill to give these three distinguished public servants power not merely to go about the country and select and take for themselves, without appeal to any human being, the land that they thought right, but also to throw upon them the almost impossible task of discriminating between the claims of the man who was now on the farm and the man who was formerly in possession of it and wanted to go back. The Estates Commissioners no doubt would bring their great ability and an impartial judgment to bear on the matters before them. But how was it possible for them to go into the details of every case of an evicted tenant or a sitting tenant? It was absolutely impossible, and a great deal of the work must be done through the inquiries held by the Assistant Commissioners. Many hon. Members profoundly regretted also that in almost every question in Ireland there entered, sooner or later, the religious question. The Government were throwing upon the Estates Commissioners through the Assistant Commissioners the obligation of investigating the circumstances and surrounding conditions of each evicted tenant. It was only after they were satisfied by their investigation that they were entitled to dispossess the sitting tenant for the purpose of reinstating the evicted tenant The Government was imposing upon the Estates Commissioners a task which they could not perform. The Chief Secretary had said that the necessity for compulsion was to be found in Clause 23 of the Report of the Commission. He had looked through the Report and he did not find the smallest foundation for the arguments used by the right hon. Gentleman. It was argued that compulsion was necessary because there were some 290 cases of landlords who had refused permission to the Estates Commissioners to inspect their estates. But when the details were examined it was found that in sixty cases the owners upon being again approached gave their consent; in sixty the farms sought to be inspected were included in the landlords' demesnes or were cultivated as home farms; in ten cases the owners would not consent to the reinstatement of the evicted tenants until the arrears of rent due at the time of the eviction were paid, and surely that was not an unreasonable stipulation; in seventy-five cases the owners were not prepared to sell; and in thirty-two cases they would not sell a farm unless the rest of the estate was also purchased. Were those cases which justified compulsion? That was the particular kind of case to which he desired to draw attention. Already in existence there was a great Act of Parliament for the transfer of land from the owner to the occupier on a voluntary basis. Was there any reason in the facts stated for taking by compulsion a portion of a man's estate to install upon it tenants evicted from some other part of Ireland, putting them alongside the existing tenants who paid their rent under the ordinary yearly tenure, taking nothing from the new-comers in respect of past debts, equipping their holdings with State money and charging rents of half the amount paid by sitting tenants, and with the prospect of ultimate possession? Was that likely to bring peace to Ireland and a settlement of the land question? Anybody connected with the agrarian question in any country knew that it would not. Let the right hon. Gentleman ask any English landlord what was likely to be the result of such an Act. They had no right to throw these duties on officials who, however able and distinguished they might be, however anxious to do justice to all parties, would find themselves in circumstances which must end in great difficulty and be a source of immense dissatisfaction and discontent. They had heard about the Lewis estate, but the late Attorney-General for Ireland had disposed of that. They had also heard something about the Clanricarde estate, and he was not quite sure that the Government were ready to found their case on that estate. Beyond these two, no case had been given where there had been on the part of the owner any obstruction which had had the result of making the reinstatement of evicted tenants impossible. There had been a suggestion from the benches opposite that the Opposition had changed their minds on this subject, and were no longer desirous of seeing the evicted tenants restored. That charge came from hon. Members opposite and not from hon. Gentlemen below the gangway who had mainly evidenced their presence by cheers and not by speeches. He denied that there was any foundation at all for that charge. They said now, as they had always said, that the reinstatement of those men who were turned out of their farms for reasons other than incompetence, drunkenness, idleness, etc., was a necessary condition of a peaceful settlement of the land question where sales took place. But this proposition was a different one. It was to give the Commissioners compulsory powers to enable them to put back men who had been evicted from their farms all over the country, selecting the land at their own discretion and to the best of their ability. That was a very different question. Their challenging the Government to justify these extraordinary compulsory powers gave no right for its being said that they had changed their minds on the subject of the reinstatement of evicted tenants. They were just as ready to do justice as were the Government and their supporters. But they contended that the Government in their effort to do justice to evicted tenants were going to do great injustice to men who were just as much entitled to their consideration as were the evicted tenants. The Government were going out of their way to displace men who had been twenty and twenty-five years, and some even longer, in possession of their holdings. As to what really was the intention of the Government they were in some doubt. The Chief Secretary had said that he did not think the language used by Lord Crewe in the House of Lords would bear the interpretation which they had put upon it. They had put no interpretation upon it at all. They took the language to express what it meant. In plain English, Lord Crewe had distinctly stated that there was no intention of using the compulsory powers of the Bill to get rid of *bona fide* farmers who were cultivating their holdings. They were giving those compulsory powers now. The Chief Secretary had suggested perfectly properly that the Opposition had admitted that compulsion, properly safeguarded, might be necessary. He himself did not believe that any case for compulsion had been made out, and he thought that very little was wanted to strengthen the hands of the Commissioners in making provision for the remaining evicted tenants without compulsion at all. But if the Government introduced compulsion they certainly ought to make it perfectly clear that tenants who were cultivating their holdings to their own advantage and to the satisfaction of their landlords should not be evicted. All they knew as the result of this debate was that powers of compulsion were to be placed wholesale in the hands of the Commissioners to be used in order to get rid of men who, in the opinion of the Government, were a source of difficulty in their neighbourhood and whom they would be glad to see removed for their own convenience and peace of mind. This was to be done in the name of peace and as a final settlement of the Irish difficulty. He submitted that no case had been made out in justification of this extraordinary action on the part of His Majesty's Government, and he sincerely hoped that they would not find that they had added to their difficulties by the language which the Attorney-General had used to-night—not that he wished the Government to escape from any difficulty, but because he was anxious that others should not suffer as a result of that for which the Government should be themselves responsible. He thought that when what had happened that evening became known in Ireland, as it must become known, the Government would find that the Bill would only open up a chapter of fresh difficulty, and would not settle in any degree the perplexed agrarian question which they would all be glad to see settled on fair and reasonable lines.

Mr. T. M. HEALY said it was disappointing and unfortunate that the right hon. Gentleman had become a leader of the Orange Party, for he could not now appeal to him as a very moderate man making a very moderate statement; as soon as they had these "orange bitters" injected into the debate, they were afforded another proof of the unwisdom of putting new wine into old bottles. The right hon. Gentleman had imported for the first time the religious difficulty into this question, and, indeed, in his new capacity, he reminded him of the actor who, in his desire thoroughly to identify himself with the part of Othello, not only blacked his face but blacked himself all over. Every other member of the Conservative Party, including the Orangemen, had conducted the debate more or less on political lines, and it had been left to the right hon. Gentleman to import the religious difficulty. Let them take the Commissioners—two out of the three were Protestants. How many more Protestants did they want?

Mr. WALTER LONG: I never made the smallest suggestion about religion.

Mr. T. M. HEALY asked what they had been listening to during the last half hour. Had not the right hon. Gentleman said that in every Irish question entered the religious difficulty, and into this question more than any other? Two out of the three Commissioners were Protestants, and one was an Englishman. What sort of a tribunal did the right hon. Gentleman require? What did the Estates Commissioners report? They reported that out of seventeen estates there were fifteen the landlords of which, including Lord Lansdowne, had been glad to get rid of these most desirable tenants. They had jumped at the offer, leaving only Lord Clanricarde, who had never seen his own estate, and had been described by the late Attorney-General as doing the devil's work in Ireland. He alluded to the present Lord Atkinson, who conducted the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin all round Ireland in a motor car. He wondered whether on that tour the right hon. Gentleman was shown the Clanricarde estate. The powers which the Government were asking for to use against these tenants were just the same as applied to every tenant who wished to sell his holding. Up to 1881 the maximum which any tenant could get as compensation when he was put out of his holding was £250, although the farm might be worth thousands. These tenants had grabbed the improvements from their predecessors. They were mostly tenants of about 40 acres, and the valuation would not be more than £30; therefore the maximum compensation would be at seven years purchase £210. A man might have a farm worth £2,000 or £3,000, representing his life's industry and also that of his ancestors, and yet these three gentlemen could step in and assess the true value at £30 if they so pleased. Considering the jurisdiction with which the Commissioners were entrusted as against the whole of the tenantry of Ireland, it was strange that that jurisdiction should be grudged to them in the case of these new tenants who had come in to steal the farms of their predecessors. It was really appalling that the sympathy of the Conservative Party should be spent on this class. Had hon. Members read the list of those who had accepted the terms offered to the landlords by the late Government? The Ponsonby estate had been settled, and so had the Lansdowne, the Massereene, and the Cloncurry estates, and the list had been almost reduced to the Clanricarde and the Lewis estates. These tenants would leave with flags flying and be put into a peaceful part of the country. And that was the crime which was being committed by this confiscatory Government.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he understood from the hon. and learned Member's arguments that the Clanricarde estate was the only estate for which these compulsory powers were required. That was exactly his own argument. It was bad procedure to make far-reaching proposals extending over the whole of the country when the only place they were required was one small insignificant spot. Why, then, should not the Government consider the propriety of confining the application of compulsory powers to that one estate and relieve the rest of Ireland from a kind of legislation which was unnecessary for at least ninety-nine-hundredths?

Mr. BIRRELL reminded the right hon. Gentleman that when he indicated his willingness to deal with the Clanricarde estate he did not get that support which the right hon. Gentleman now proposed to give him. There were, however, other parts of Ireland and other landlords than Lord Clanricarde to whom it might be found necessary to apply compulsory powers.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 225; Noes, 69. (Division List, No. 290.)

AYES.

Abraham,William (Cork, N.E)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, Redmond J.(Tyrone,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boland, John
Brace, William
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clancy, John Joseph
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies,David (MontgomeryCo.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glen-Coats,Sir T. (Renfrew, W.
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Harvey,W.E. (Derbyshire, N.E
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice

Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
Mallet, Charles E.
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morse, L. L.
Murnaghan, George
Murray, James
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Raphael, Herbert H.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Scott, A.H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E.
Thorne, William
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Watt, Henry A.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williamson, A.
Wilson, Hon. C.H.W. (Hull, W.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Balfour, Rt Hn. A J. (City of Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boyle, Sir Edward
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C.W.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W.V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gretton, John
Harrsion-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F.W.F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Keswick, William
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Renton, Major Leslie
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W.H. (Lancashire)
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Ashley and Mr. Lonsdale.

And, it being after Eleven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

Adjourned at twelve minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 18*th July*, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8); Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9); Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12).

Also the Certificate that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill:—Local Government Provisional Order (No. 15).

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Portobello and Musselburgh Tramways (Levenhall Extension) Order Confirmation Bill [h.l.]. — Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [h.l.].—Amendments reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3ª on Monday next.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COLONIES: ANNUAL.

No. 528. Bermuda (Report for 1906).

BRUNEI.

Report on the State of Brunei for 1906.

TREATY SERIES, No. 20 (1907).

Accession of Cuba, Dominican Republic, Hayti, and Paraguay to the Convention sign d at Geneva, 22nd August, 1864, for the amelioration of the condition of the wounded in armies in the field, 6th July, 1907.

COMMERCIAL, No. 7 (1907).

International Sugar Commission, Spring Session, 1907. Report of Proceedings (in continuation of Commercial, No. 1 (1907)).

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3859. Austria-Hungary (Trieste).

No. 3860. China (Teng Yuch).

No. 3861. Japan (Shimonoseki).

Presented (by Command), and ordere to lie on the Table.

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL PARCEL POST, PERU).

The Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 8) Warrant, 1907, dated 29th June, 1907. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

FIJI.

Return giving correspondence between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Government of Fiji, respecting the sale of certain lands in the Provinces of Rewa and Naitasiri. Presented (pursuant to order of Tuesday last), and to be printed. (No. 120.)

COMPANIES (CONSOLIDATION) BILL [h.l.].

A Bill to consolidate the Companies Act, 1862, and the Acts amending it—Was presented by the Lord Granard (*E. Granard*); read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Tuesday next. (No. 121.)

INJURED ANIMALS ACT (1894) AMENDMENT BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

*Lord ABERDARE: My Lords, this Bill is a very short one, and in view of the important matters which are coming before your Lordships I will not occupy more than a minute or two in describing its objects. It is a Bill to amend and enlarge the Injured Animals Act, 1894. That Act provided for the slaughter of injured horses, mules, or asses by or by order of the police, and it is proposed in this Bill that the definition of "animal"

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

shall also include any bull, cow, ox, heifer, calf, sheep, goat, or swine. A case arose in which a heifer had fallen into a quarry, and a merciful police constable who shot it in order to put it out of its pain was proceeded against and fined £9. I am sure your Lordships will agree that this was a rather cruel sentence for an act of mercy. Moreover, the Act of 1894 did not provide for the case of diseased animals, but they are included in this Bill. The Bill has passed through the House of Commons, and I hope your Lordships will agree to give it a Second Reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Aberdare.*)

EARL BEAUCHAMP: My Lords, I need only say that His Majesty's Government will be very glad to do all in their power to assist the noble Lord in passing this Bill through your Lordships' House.

On Question, Bill read 2ª and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES BILL.

Report of Amendments received.

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH moved to amend Clause 1, Subsection (5), by deleting all the words after the words "Houses of Parliament." The subsection, as amended, would read—

> "All schemes made in pursuance of this Part of this Act shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament."

He explained that it had been thought more convenient to have all the provisions as to the laying of schemes as well as Orders in Council before Parliament in Clause 36.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 3, line 13, to leave out from the word 'Parliament' to the end of Subsection (5)."—(*The Earl of Portsmouth.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

EARL FORTESCUE moved to add a new subsection:—"(7) The chairman of the Association may receive such remuneration as the Association think reasonable." This subsection was, he explained, taken from the Municipal Corporations Act, which was also incorporated by reference in the County Councils Act of 1888. He thought the County Associations which were to be set up in the future ought to have the same powers, if they thought fit to use them, of giving remuneration to their chairmen as municipal corporations and county councils possessed. It was well known that these powers had been sparingly exercised by town councils, and even more sparingly by county councils. It was equally well known that a good many gentlemen had been at one time or another appointed to the position of mayor partly owing to their possessing private means, and that many qualified persons had been obliged to decline the honour through lack of private income. It was most desirable, from the national point of view, that the best man should be obtained to fill the office of chairman of the Association, and he thought it was possible that in some cases the man best qualified for the purpose might already have a great deal to do and be obliged to say that he could only undertake the work by giving up a directorship or by employing another clerk, and that though he was willing enough to give his time he could not afford to give his money as well, and therefore could not undertake this office unless he was put in the same position monetarily as he would be in if he did not fill it. The Associations should not be prevented from obtaining the services of a gentleman of that character through the lack of power to pay remuneration. If the mayor of, say, Poplar or West Ham made a mess of things, only the borough concerned suffered; but if, owing to any lack of efficiency in the County Association of, say, Sussex, an enemy succeeded in landing upon our shores, the whole country would suffer. He therefore hoped the Government would accept the Amendment.

Amendment moved:—

> "In page 3, line 29, after the word 'volunteers' to insert the following new subsection: '(7) The chairman of the Association may receive such remuneration as the Association think reasonable.'"—(*Earl Fortescue.*)

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH was unable to accept the Amendment, which, in the opinion of the Government, ran counter to the whole spirit of the scheme. The Government had never contemplated paying salaries to any member of the Association except the secretary, who would probably require several paid clerks under him. The whole conception of the Associations was that all the members should give their services voluntarily, and the Government had every reason to believe that a sufficient number of gentlemen would consent to serve upon the Associations. It was really essential to the efficiency of the Territorial Army that all the expenses not directly connected with the maintenance of the Force should be kept down to the lowest level, and it was the intention of the Army Council that the expenses of the Associations should not be allowed to exceed what was absolutely necessary to meet what was required of them. The worst possible service the Associations could do to the Territorial Army would be to divert from the funds handed to them by Parliament more than was absolutely necessary for the economical working of the Associations. He hoped the noble Earl would not press the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

VISCOUNT ESHER moved to amend Clause 2, Paragraph (*f*)—

"(*f*) Establishing or assisting cadet battalions and corps and also rifle clubs,"

by adding the words—

"provided that no financial assistance out of money voted by Parliament shall be given by an association in respect of any person in a battalion or corps in a school in receipt of a Parliamentary grant until such person has attained the age of sixteen."

In moving this Amendment, he hoped the noble Earl the Under-Secretary would not think him discourteous if he appealed, not to His Majesty's Government, but to the majority of their Lordships, who on a recent occasion voted for this subsection as it now stood. It was unnecessary and it would be unbecoming in him to attempt to recall to their Lordships the arguments which were so forcibly and so conclusively put by his noble and gallant friend Lord Methuen in favour of leaving to the associations which were about to be set up under the Bill the power to train boys under the age of sixteen. Their Lordships would remember that by the clause as it stood in the Bill as it came up to their Lordships' House any such assistance was illegal and impossible. Yet, when Lord Methuen proposed to amend the clause, no arguments, if he might venture to say so, were brought forward by His Majesty's Government to controvert those which his noble and gallant friend used. It was true that the noble Earl the Under-Secretary urged the plea of privilege, and the point he took was that the privileges of the other House were infringed by the action of Lord Methuen. He did not propose to say anything on that point, which he did not think was one which carried very much weight with their Lordships. Another argument was used. The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack appeared to be very much influenced by the fact that the special representatives of the working classes in the House of Commons were opposed to the training of young boys to arms. On that he would like to say, with great deference, that even if they admitted that the working classes were of one mind on this point, which he ventured to ask their Lordships to believe could only be asserted with some degree of doubt, it was not always that the working classes were themselves the best judges of their own interests. The Factory Acts, for instance, were strongly opposed by the representatives of the working classes both in the House of Commons and in the country. That was not a point which he desired to press, but he could not refrain from alluding to it, owing to its having been raised by so eminent an authority as the Lord Chancellor. He did not deny that in dealing with moneys under their control the House of Commons could make their own terms. This Amendment as now proposed admitted to the full this contention. But the Amendment was based upon other considerations. If the Bill went down as it stood to the House of Commons it was very unlikely that this subsection in its present form would be agreed to. One of two things must happen, either the point of privilege would be raised, in which case the subsection in its present form, would, he imagined, not be put, and the Bill would return to their Lordships in its original shape; or the Speaker would allow their Lordships' Amendment to be put. In the latter case it did not require a great stretch of imagination to conceive that in all probability the Amendment would be rejected and the Bill returned to their Lordships in the shape in which it was originally presented to them. He hoped his noble and gallant friend and their Lordships would feel that this would be a serious mischance, and a matter of grave regret to all who, like himself, strongly sympathise with Lord Methuen and the majority of the House on this question. He hoped, therefore, that their Lordships would agree to the Amendment. It met, he ventured to think, all reasonable objection on the part of the House of Commons. It provided what was only just and fair—that the associations should be empowered to apply moneys which accrued to them from private sources to the use of cadet corps should they think fit to do so. That was surely not an unreasonable demand. No one's hands were tied. Neither the County Associations nor the Board of Education were bound by this Amendment. It carried out what he believed was the intention of the House of Commons, and it went a long way to meet the aspirations and demands of his noble and gallant friend Lord Methuen. He reminded the House that the provision was only permissive, and expressed the hope that the Amendment would not only be accepted by their Lordships but also in the other House.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 23, after the word 'clubs' to insert the words 'provided that no financial assistance out of money voted by Parliament shall be given by an association in respect of any person in a battalion or corps in a school in receipt of a Parliamentary grant until such person has attained the age of sixteen.'"—(*Viscount Esher.*)

*THE EARL OF MEATH expressed regret that he was unable, when the Bill was in Committee, to move the Amendment he had placed on the Paper, and he desired to thank his noble and gallant friend Lord Methuen for fathering the Amendment for him, and also those noble Lords who supported it and carried it to such a triumphant conclusion. They now heard the noble Viscount who had just sat down urging their Lordships nine days afterwards to alter completely the decision to which they came by the large majority of ninety-nine, and the arguments he had used were by no means conclusive. If their Lordships were to alter their decision within nine days they would be doing something very like stultifying themselves, especially in the face of the strong expression of opinion given. The country would consider that their Lordships had very little confidence in their own opinion if they now changed the whole complexion of their decision, as was proposed by the noble Viscount. The Amendment was aimed at what to his mind was the most important part of the Bill as originally introduced in the House of Commons. It was important that the youth of this country should be trained to the use of arms out of State funds; under the Amendment, on the other hand, they, as private individuals, would have to subscribe to what ought to be a national work. The very thing which they approved of in this Bill as originally introduced was that the State recognised the fact that every citizen should do his duty and should learn it in youth at the cost of the State; but now they were asked to put their hands into their pockets and subscribe towards the defence of the country. Unless their Lordships desired to stultify themselves, they ought to adhere to the decision at which they arrived in Committee, and which he was perfectly confident was the right decision. When Mr. Haldane originally introduced his Bill he said he wanted the youth of the nation to undergo training so that they could keep the reservoir always full. The Secretary of State said they wanted to work the cadet corps into a more important position, and by so doing they would, Mr. Haldane said, allay fear and give people a sense of security which they had not hitherto had. That was what all their Lordships desired. Mr. Haldane went on to say that from every point of view cadet corps were things to be encouraged in the interest of the nation. But now they were asked to reverse all this. They were told that it was absolutely wicked, and that they ought to be ashamed to teach young lads how to shoot; they would go and shoot their grandmothers. He knew that the Under-Secretary had repudiated the doctrine that it would encourage militarism. He was thankful to hear that statement, and he hoped there were many of the noble Earl's followers who believed him. But while admitting that it would not introduce militarism, the noble Earl had stated that what the Government wanted was to increase the fighting forces of the country, and that this proposal would not help them, because it had reference only to the training of lads. While not advocating conscription, he (Lord Meath) held that every lad should be trained to arms, and that it was the duty of every man to be able to defend his country if called upon to do so. That was the position originally taken up by Mr. Haldane. Why did he recede from it? It was not for him to say what the right hon. Gentleman's motives were, but it was most extraordinary that within so short a time he should absolutely reverse the opinion he had publicly expressed in regard to the necessity of training the nation in arms. The phrase "nation in arms" originated, he believed, with Mr. Haldane. Well, why did he suddenly change? A deputation of men, some of them, doubtless, having great influence in the country, but not very numerous, called upon the right hon. Gentleman and pointed out the dangers of militarism which the Under-Secretary had repudiated; the great argument they used against the proposal was that it would advance militarism. The right hon. Gentleman appeared to have fallen flat on his face before the deputation; he apparently agreed to everything they asked, and his colleagues elsewhere had to follow suit and declare it was all a mistake. This was not the first time that they had had members of His Majesty's Government saying one thing one day and saying absolutely another a few days afterwards; and they had, therefore, got rather accustomed to it. But he hoped that their Lordships would not support the action of the Government in altering so fundamental a provision in their Bill. The Bill as it came up to their Lordships would have made it absolutely illegal for any County Association to give money towards the training of lads under sixteen. It was perfectly true that the Amendment now proposed by the noble Viscount would, if passed, so far relieve the situation that the associations could accept private money given to them for this training; but private individuals could give money now for this purpose, and there was no need to send it to the County Associations. They lived in a free country still, thank God! and could give money if they liked towards the maintenance of cadet corps. Mr. Haldane had said he wanted to fill the reservoir by training lads so as to create a nation in arms. When danger threatened, these trained lads, by that time grown into men, would—not be compelled to serve out of the country—but be available for its service. Had they forgotten the lesson of the South African War, when we lost thousands and thousands of valuable lives, because those men who went out could neither ride nor shoot, nor do anything else but offer their bodies as targets to the enemy? Let them do what they could to avoid such a lamentable result again by training boys in time. The Secretary of State was doing his very best to make the success of his Bill impossible. Its object was to increase the forces of the country; they would not do that unless they trained their lads in early youth. Very few Volunteers joined after the age of eighteen. At seventeen a lad ceased to be a cadet and became a Volunteer, obtaining his grant. Therefore, if they wished to encourage cadet corps they must train lads before the age of sixteen, or they would not get them at all. The years immediately after sixteen were the spring-time of a young man's life, and they knew that in spring a young man's fancy lightly turned to thoughts of love. The young woman was the great enemy at that age. A young man would not lock himself up in a drill hall, unless he was compelled to, when he had a young woman waiting for him round the corner. After sixteen a young man had either become a confirmed loafer or had made up his mind what his profession was going to be, and was rightly intent upon that profession. The great majority were in the latter position, and they were not going—this was what they would say

—to waste their time drilling when they got no encouragement and when everything was done to handicap the man who gave up his time, money, and pleasure for patriotic duty. There was not only business and the young woman round the corner, but another thing to be considered—at that age a young man had just broken loose from all the trammels of school and of authority, and he was not going voluntarily to put himself under authority again. He therefore went off, and they did not get him. If they had the lads trained in early youth, they got over that drudgery and "barrack-square" routine which prevented many adults who had a notion that they were not dignified from enlisting or from joining the Volunteer force. He could not understand this terrible timidity, this continual yielding to the cries of hostile sections of their Party, on the part of a Government supported by the largest majority they had seen for centuries. Even if all the hostile sections in the other House were to combine, the Government would still possess an overwhelming majority. The noble Earl the Under-Secretary smiled. He was afraid the noble Earl did not recognise the value of that majority as much as he ought. There could be, in his mind, no more effective guarantee for the peace of the world than a citizen Army. They had been told that this "nation in arms" would be a danger; that if they trained the nation to arms they would want to fight. That was a perfect fallacy. When a man had to do his own fighting he was much less ready to quarrel. There was a great deal of truth in the opinion held on the continent that there was no country so ready to go to war as this country, and foreigners attributed this to the fact that there were large masses in this country who had never known what it was to suffer in their own persons and were quite unfamiliar with the horrors, the terrors, and the privations of war. By having a hired soldiery the people of this country could shelter themselves behind those men and clamour for war. Until the nation was trained to arms they could rest assured that they would ever have these continual panics and continual dreads. However powerful might be our Fleet, and however well trained our sailors, no one could say that some horrible chance might not overtake this country and for a short period of forty-eight hours leave us unprepared. This was too great a country, the people were too patriotic a people, our Empire was too great an Empire, to run any risks. To his mind it was a most extraordinary fact that the people who were most opposed to a citizen Army in this country were those whose political feeling leaned towards radicalism and democracy. He could not understand the true democrat being opposed to a citizen Army. The true democrat everywhere else was in favour of a citizen Army; they could not point to any country in the world where the true democrat was not in favour of such an Army. Our Colonies had led the way, and there was not a single British Colony, except, perhaps, the new ones, which would follow suit shortly, which had not gone in for the systematic training of lads at school. Switzerland had for ages and ages had its citizen Army. Yet, forsooth, the democracy in this country said, "Give us a hired Army, but for goodness sake do not give us a citizen Army." It was the irony of fate that it should be left to their Lordships' House to defend what ought to be defended by every democrat who was true to his colours. His own desire was to see some really practical steps taken towards making this country safe by the universal military training—not conscription—of all British subjects.

*Earl ROBERTS thought the alteration in the clause as it came from the other House would, if it was maintained, do more to injure Mr. Haldane's idea of a Territorial Army on a voluntary basis than anything else. He should continue to urge it was essential that our boys should get an early training, but he was inclined to think that half a loaf was better than no bread, and as he understood that, if the Bill were passed in the form in which it came to that House, the County Associations would have been prohibited from making use even of privately-subscribed funds for the training of boys in cadet corps, he would vote for the Amendment, It was most important that we should do all in our power to train our boys, and he thought the best thing they could do, until the other House had, if he might say so, seen the error of its ways, was to accept the noble Viscount's Amendment, and hope that the necessary funds would be forthcoming for the purpose.

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH said he did not know that it was necessary for him to say much upon this Amendment. All he could say, speaking for the Government, was that they would support the proviso, but it had nothing to do with those on the Government Bench.

LORD NEWTON asked whether the noble Earl meant that he washed his hands of the Amendment. Could not the Government give any undertaking to get it accepted in another place? They were responsible for this Bill, and the noble Earl was not entitled to assume an attitude of complete indifference towards changes in a Bill of this character. After the noble Earl's statement, he hoped the House would not agree to the Amendment, but would maintain their original attitude. At any rate, the Amendment should not be accepted without some statement by a responsible Member of the Government that the Government would do their best to secure its acceptance in another place.

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: It would be impossible for me to say what would be done in another place. But we shall give our friendly support to the proviso. We cannot go further.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, the attitude of the noble Earl who has charge of this Bill, not for the first time, has excited a certain amount of surprise. Here is a proposal of the very first importance, which has twice been discussed at great length—a proposal which evidently greatly interests and moves many noble Lords; and yet the noble Earl in charge of the Bill tells us that he is quite unable to give the House any assistance.

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: I said that the Government would support the Amendment, but I could not speak for the whole body of the House of Commons.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: The noble Earl has now advanced one step further. We did not gather a moment ago that His Majesty's Government were prepared, as I now understand they are, to support the Amendment of my noble friend Lord Esher with all the authority which they know they possess in another place. To my mind that makes the whole difference. As to the merits of the Amendment, I should like for one moment to remind your Lordships that there was nothing in the Bill as it stood when it was introduced to make it obligatory on the County Associations to assist these cadet corps and rifle clubs. I dwell upon that, because I think the speech of the noble Earl, Lord Meath, was rather based upon the assumption that the Amendment would take away from the Bill a provision which would have enabled us to obtain what he and others have described as "a nation in arms." The Bill never contained any provision of the sort. The clause is a purely permissive one, and it is only a permissive clause which we should lose if this Amendment were to be made. I caught an observation by Lord Esher in his opening remarks to which I wish for a moment to call attention. I understood him to say, in moving his Amendment, that he admitted to the full the contention that the Amendment inserted by your Lordships in Committee the other evening was *ultra vires* as a breach of the privilege of the House of Commons.

VISCOUNT ESHER: I said that I thought it was a matter of considerable doubt.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: At any rate I desire to say that if I vote for the Amendment I shall certainly not do so with any idea of admitting that the original Amendment was a breach of the privilege of the House of Commons. I remain absolutely unconvinced upon that point, and I desire to guard myself against such admission. What does the Amendment of my noble friend Lord Esher do? It is clear that these County Associations will dispose of funds derived from two different sources. There will be funds received from the Government in the shape of a block-grant which we understand is to be made by the War Office to these associations, and there will be other funds contributed from different sources. As the Bill stood when it came up to this House, the County Associations found themselves absolutely precluded from spending any money, no matter from what sources derived, upon these cadet corps and rifle clubs. The Amendment of my noble friend Lord Esher will at any rate to some extent cure that defect, because it makes it clear that the only disability imposed on the County Associations has reference to money received from Government sources. It seems to me, therefore, that the Amendment does very considerably relieve the situation. I am bound to add that the more we consider the position and duties of these County Associations, the more evident does it become that the expenditure which their operations will necessitate will be an enormous expenditure. We are quite unable to arrive at any conjecture as to the extent to which that expenditure may reach, and therefore I feel a certain misgiving at the idea of adding to the responsibilities, or to the possible responsibilities, of the associations, a responsibility for the great number of cadet battalions and rifle clubs which exist or may spring up in great numbers all over the country. On the whole, therefore, I am disposed to accept the compromise—for it is a compromise—which my noble friend Lord Esher has proposed; but if I am to give my vote for him, should we go to a division, I do desire to be assured, and I hope we shall be assured in the most specific terms, that the Amendment will be supported by His Majesty's Government in another place, and that we are not likely to have the Bill sent back to us with neither the original Amendment nor the Amendment now proposed by Lord Esher.

*THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, I merely desire to make two observations. In the first place, I confirm, so far as I am able to do so, the impression which is in the noble Marquess's mind as to the difference which the insertion of this provision would make in the Bill as it came up to your Lordships' House. I quite agree that under the Bill as it came up it would not have been competent for an association to spend any money, however derived, on these cadet corps; and I think the noble Earl, Lord Meath, was in error in imagining that in any case that would have been possible. The second observation I have to make is that it undoubtedly is the case that in another place His Majesty's Government will do their best to see that this provision becomes part of the final provisions of the Bill.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

*VISCOUNT MIDLETON moved to insert words converting the duty of the association as to safe custody of arms and equipment into a duty to provide accommodation for that safe custody. When this question was raised in Committee, the noble Earl the Under-Secretary undertook to bring up words on Report which would deal with the point; and the noble Earl had now informed him that he was willing to accept this Amendment.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 26, before the word 'the' to insert the words 'providing accommodation for.'"—(*Viscount Midleton.*)

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: I accept the Amendment.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

*VISCOUNT MIDLETON moved another Amendment to provide that the requirements on mobilisation, to be supplied by the County Associations, should be embodied, where practicable, in the regulations. This question was raised by Lord Lovat in Committee, and the noble Earl the Under-Secretary then undertook to consider to what extent he could pledge the Government that these regulations would be so laid down. The noble Earl now informed him that he would be willing to agree to the insertion after paragraph (i)—

"(*i*) The supply of the requirements on mobilisation of the units of the Territorial Force within the county, in so far as those requirements are directed by the Army Council to be met locally."

of the words—

"Such requirements, where practicable, to be embodied in Regulations."

This did not carry out the whole desire of Lord Lovat, who wished that the scheme should be laid down on the passing of the Act. This was, however, an administrative question, and he understood that it had received the careful consideration of the Secretary of State, and that his view was that it would not be practicable, immediately on the passing of the Act, to frame requirements on mobilisation with regard to the whole of the Territorial Army, and that all he was able to do was to embody the requirements in the regulations whereever practicable. He begged to move.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 30, after the word 'locally' to insert the words 'such requirements, where practicable, to be embodied in regulations.'"—(*Viscount Midleton.*)

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: I accept the Amendment.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD BLYTHSWOOD moved to insert the following subsection: "The members of an association shall not be under any pecuniary liability for any act done by them in their capacity as members of such association in carrying out the provisions of this Act." In moving this Amendment he hoped it would be understood that he did so entirely in the interests of the Bill. He was convinced that in default of such a provision, it would not be possible to induce men to serve on the associations and incur an unlimited liability. They could not force people to serve, and they had the dictum of the Lord President that if the money given by Parliament to the associations was not sufficient to carry out the work, the associations would be liable. Therefore they would not get these gentlemen to serve. It was very difficult to see where, in his county, they were going to get the members from. Most of the gentlemen who were qualified were already on the county council and the other bodies. the work of which was exceedingly onerous; and it was unreasonable to expect them to come forward and undertake further work if they were to be liable for expenses incurred under the Act. In his own county there were three strong battalions of Volunteers—in all some thirty-nine companies. At £75 per company the association would receive £2,925. Would that sum in any way cover the expenses which the County Association would have to face under the Bill?

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH said he did not wish to interrupt the noble Lord; but he thought it might perhaps save time if he stated that the Government would be pleased to accept the Amendment.

LORD BLYTHSWOOD said that, in those circumstances, he would not say more, but would move the Amendment.

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 29, after the word 'Treasury' to insert the following new subsection:—'(7) The members of an association shall not be under any pecuniary liability for any act done by them in their capacity as members of such association in carrying out the provisions of this Act."—(*Lord Blythswood.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

EARL FORTESCUE in Clause 5 (Raising and Maintenance of Force) moved the insertion of a new subsection. He said the words were taken almost verbatim from the County Councils Act, and as he understood the Government accepted the Amendment he would move it without further explanation.

Amendment moved—

"In page 6, line 33, after the word 'made' to insert the following new subsection:—'(4)—(*a*) Any County Associations may from time to time join in appointing out of their respective bodies a joint committee for any purpose in respect of which they are jointly interested; (*b*) Any Association appointing a joint committee under this subsection may delegate to it any power which such Association might exercise for the purpose for which the committee is appointed; (*c*) Subject to the terms of delegation any such joint committee shall in respect of any matter delegated to it have the same power in all respects as the Associations appointing it; (*d*) The costs of a joint committee shall be defrayed by the Associations by whom it has been appointed, in such proportion as may be agreed between them, and the accounts of such joint committees and their officers shall for the purposes of the provisions of this Act be deemed to be accounts of the Associations appointing them and of their officers.' "—(*Earl Fortescue.*)

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH said the Government would accept the Amendment, but he thought it would be better that it should come in as a new clause to follow Clause 4.

EARL FORTESCUE said he would move the Amendment in the shape of a new clause.

On Question, Amendment agreed to, and new clause added to the Bill.

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH, in Clause 6 (Government, discipline, and pay), moved an Amendment in the second subsection providing that an Order may be issued providing for the constitution of a permanent staff, including adjutants and staff sergeants, who " may " (instead of " shall," as in the Bill) be members of the Regular Forces, and may regulate the appointment, rank, duties, and numbers of the officers and non-commissioned officers of the Territorial Force. It was to be remembered that the contemplated change would not be made all at once, but would be deferred until the training machinery of the Territorial Army was in working order and training units had been established. The Army Council had gone very carefully into this question and made most careful inquiries, and they had come to the conclusion that it would be for the ultimate benefit of the Territorial Army if Regular assistance in training the men was dispensed with in future, and commanding officers realised that they were themselves solely responsible for the training of the men as well as the need of bringing their officers to regard themselves as the only instructors of the men under their charge. Formerly the adjutant of a regiment or battalion was looked upon as its chief instructor, and far too great reliance was placed on his knowledge and experience. In the future it was considered desirable that the adjutant's energy should be concentrated on the administrative duties connected with his unit, while assistance in training matters would be provided by the training battalions which were to be called into being to supply it. In connection with the disappearance of the Regular adjutants there was no desire to effect any petty economy at the ultimate expense of the Territorial Army. They had been guided in this matter by the advice of the general staff who had been engaged in discovering the best possible system of training. They had also fortified their opinion by reports from those possessing practical experience, and these had unmistakably, and almost without exception, shown that the presence of a Regular adjutant had often tended to produce on the part of the officers of the Auxiliary Forces a lack of energy in training units. At least one commanding officer assured them that he had done without the assistance of a Regular adjutant for some years with marked advantage, and that on no account would he revert to the system which was now generally in vogue. There was another practical difficulty. He did not think it had been appreciated what the effect of leaving in the word " shall " would be. One very important result would be that from the moment the Bill passed every Volunteer battalion must either have a Regular adjutant or no adjutant at all, so that if no Regular adjutant were available it would have to employ someone as acting adjutant without pay. What an important change this would effect would be obvious when he told their Lordships that in March last there were some twenty-seven paid acting adjutants attached to Volunteer battalions. For these reasons he hoped their Lordships would agree to substitute the word " may " for the more imperative word " shall."

Amendment moved—

" In page 7, line 18, to leave out the word ' shall ' and to insert the word ' may.' "—(*The Earl of Portsmouth.*)

THE EARL OF ERROLL said that he looked upon it as being a point of vital importance that the adjutant of the Auxiliary Forces should belong to the Regular Army. He had considerable experience with the Yeomanry, and he knew from that experience how necessary it was that the adjutant should be a member of the Regular Army. If the commanding officers were able to devote the whole of their time to the training of the men, perhaps the services of the adjutant would not be necessary; but a great many of them were busy men whose time was occupied with private affairs, and it was impossible that they should be able to devote sufficient time to instruct their men thoroughly. It was thus necessary that there should be at least one officer in the regiment who was actually up to date and in touch with modern ideas, and the only way to attain this end was to employ an officer of the Regular Forces. He hoped that the Amendment would not be accepted.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY strongly opposed the Amendment. It was said that a colonel who had a Regular adjutant was inclined to lean too much upon the adjutant and leave the whole burden of training to him. If that were so, it was the fault of the higher military authorities for permitting it. No commanding officer of an Auxiliary unit who was fit for his post ought to rely upon the adjutant entirely. Therefore their Lordships must not accept the argument of the crutch. Then it was contended the adjutant might interfere with the scheme of training which had been circulated. He could not see why the presence of a Regular adjutant should interfere with that scheme of training. On the contrary, the presence of the adjutant would greatly assist the work of those Regular officers who would have to go round inspecting. By far the most important point in any scheme of Army reform was the number of Regular officers. We could not extemporise trained Regular officers, and in the stress of a great war the country would give anything to have Regular officers to send to the front. According to estimates for this year the present establishment of Regular officers was 8,360, but after the changes which the Secretary of State contemplated in his scheme we should only have a total of 7,970. Although trained Regular officers were of vital importance to the country, under the administration of the present Secretary of State we should be short of the present establishment by 300 or 400. He hoped their Lordships would adhere to the Bill as it stood and not pass the Amendment. If they kept the Bill as it was, they left the adjutants as quartermasters in the Territorial Force, and there would be scarcely any diminution in the number of officers. If the Amendment were carried, it would mean a considerable loss of officers of the Regular Army.

LORD RIBBLESDALE said he understood the noble Earl to say that one of the Government's reasons for developing the drilling aptitude of officers of the Territorial regiments was that the adjutants should have more time to devote to administrative duties. He remembered very well that when he was in the Army adjutants were divided into two sorts—the adjutants who lived in the orderly room and the adjutants who lived in the barrack square. If a smart regiment was wanted they were always more likely to get it from the adjutant who spent his time in the barrack square. He would like to know whether by administrative duties it was meant that the adjutants were to devote their time entirely to office work and correspondence, and that the whole of the drilling and smartening of the regiments was to be done by the regimental officers.

*LORD ZOUCHE OF HARYNGWORTH hoped the House would pause before accepting the Amendment, which seemed to him to go to the very root of the whole question of the efficiency of the Territorial Forces. It was difficult to understand what had led to this change on the part of His Majesty's Government, because the words as they originally stood——

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I beg the noble Lord's pardon. The words were inserted as an Amendment from his own side of the House.

*LORD ZOUCHE OF HARYNGWORTH contended that, whatever the origin or source of the provision, the word "shall" should remain in the Bill. The Territorial Forces, more especially as regarded the Volunteers had only limited opportunities when they could drill and make themselves efficient. They started knowing very little, and it was of the utmost importance that they should have the advantages of competent instructors. The assistance which a

Regular adjutant could give a battalion was of the greatest value. The Amendment would deal not only with adjutants but with staff sergeants. If the expression staff sergeants meant the ordinary company drill instructors, then he ventured to say a fatal blow would be struck at the efficient training of the Territorial Army should they be withdrawn. The art of teaching drill to men who previously knew nothing about it required special training in itself, and in nine cases out of ten instruction could not be efficiently given by a person who had not himself received that technical training which membership of His Majesty's Regular Forces would give him.

Lord MONTAGU of BEAULIEU said that, having been responsible for the insertion of the original Amendment, he wished to say two or three words on the subject. As a Volunteer he should prefer to have Regular adjutants, but, after reading the Secretary of State's Paper, he thought that Regular adjutants might not be necessary under the new system of training. He asked the Government to give an undertaking that the Regular adjutants should not be withdrawn until experience had shown whether the Territorial scheme was satisfactory or not.

The Duke of NORTHUMBERLAND agreed that a Militia officer, who had a considerable amount of experience, ought to be independent of his adjutant. But it was almost impossible for a Volunteer officer to acquire that knowledge of military matters which would enable him to do without the help of an adjutant. It was not so much a question of drill as of military discipline. Military discipline was a habit; it could not be learned from books. He had himself watched from year to year the discipline of a regiment gradually improving, because of the steady effect of a proper and wise exercise of discipline upon them. They learned unconsciously the habit of discipline. It was on exactly this point that the Volunteer commanding officer was extremely ignorant, and he was liable to be either too lax or too severe. These were faults which the Volunteer commanding officer learned to avoid from the experience of a Regular adjutant. It might, perhaps, be true that this placed the commanding officer in the position of having a crutch, but he was convinced that in this matter of military discipline the assistance of the Regular adjutant was absolutely essential.

*Lord LUCAS said that one or two of the speeches that had been delivered by noble Lords opposite were made under the impression that the two alternatives before the House were either to continue the present system of having Regular adjutants, or go back to the system of having no adjutants at all. That was not the case. As had been already made abundantly plain by the Secretary of State, this proposed change, if it was made, would be made gradually. It was certainly not until the new training machinery was in working order that any step would be taken to abolish the Regular adjutants. The new machinery was the result of careful consideration of the problem of training. It was the view of the General Staff that they would be able to get a better form of instruction by this method. As to the point raised by the noble Lord opposite, Lord Zouche, with regard to staff-sergeants, those sergeants stood in a different category from Regular adjutants. The staff-sergeant had to drill the men night after night, and that was a thing which no officer of the Territorial Force could do. He understood there was no intention of doing away with the Regular sergeant-instructors who would continue to be attached, as at present, to the units of the Territorial Force. With regard to the argument of the crutch, everybody knew that Lord Salisbury was a commanding officer who required assistance from no one, but the noble Marquess had been a commanding officer so long that he had probably forgotten what the feelings of the younger officers were. It did not develop the power of command in a young officer to have a Regular officer who was ready to tell him what to do whenever he was in doubt, and who literally acted as a crutch to him. What did give a man confidence was to have a knowledge of his subject. In the ordinary Volunteer regiment, unless a man gave a great deal of time to it, there was no method by which he could really learn his work.

The result was that an officer went on parade not knowing how to command. If this new scheme worked out as they hoped, they would be able to give real instruction to their officers and non-commissioned officers. Surely that would develop in them the power to command. He agreed that it was of the greatest importance to maintain the connection between the Regular Army and the Territorial Army, but these men ought to provide just as good a link as the Volunteer adjutant did at present. As to administration, the Regular adjutant up to the present had been the administrative and training authority. When the new scheme came into force training would not be in the hands of the Regular adjutant, who would be simply an administrative officer. He thought it would be impossible to give a pledge that the change should not take place within a definite time, but it would probably be two or three years before it was begun.

EARL BROWNLOW suggested as an alternative to the Amendment that after the word "shall" the words "as far as possible" should be inserted. The provision would then read—

> "and may provide for the constitution of a permanent staff, including adjutants and staff sergeants who shall as far as possible be members of His Majesty's Regular Forces."

It was desirable that Regular officers should be appointed as adjutants, but there had been times when it was impossible to get Regular officers to take up these duties. At the outbreak of the South African War he had the honour of commanding a Volunteer brigade, and his brigade-major and one of his adjutants were taken away. The result was that he had to go on for two years with a Volunteer brigade-major and a Volunteer adjutant, and as brigadier he greatly missed the presence of the Regular brigade-major, although he was bound to admit that the Volunteer officer, who had had great experience in the Volunteers, performed the duties temporarily to his entire satisfaction. If such a contingency should occur again it would be absolutely necessary to appoint a Volunteer. Although he most cordially endorsed what had been said by Volunteer officers that evening as to the desirability of having Regular officers in these posts, still the insertion of the words he suggested would leave a loophole for appointing Volunteers in cases where it was impossible to get Regular officers.

LORD LOVAT said their Lordships would have to make up their mind whether they were going to follow the advice of the General Staff or of noble Lords who commanded units and who had addressed them that evening. To his mind the whole question of Volunteer service turned on the question of discipline, and discipline could only be got by having some authority in a regiment who not only knew his work, but who was known by the whole of the regiment to know it. He was one of those who believed in the training of officers, but why should they throw away the adjutants who were a stand-by to many a battalion? He would not enter into the crutch question, but it had been demonstrated that under this scheme voluntary contributions would be expected to a fairly large extent, and therefore they could not expect commanding officers of units to be appointed to that position through efficiency alone; the power of their purse and the question of seniority would play important parts. If the selection of the commanding officers of the Territorial units was to be by qualification alone, the Regular adjutants might be allowed to go, but not otherwise. They really must have some assurance from His Majesty's Government that the great bulk of these men were going to be Regular soldiers. They had no such assurance now, because Lord Lucas had practically admitted that after a short time there would be no Regular officers. He was sure every Volunteer officer would regard that with great concern. It had been stated that there was some idea of employing senior Militia officers in this capacity. There was a certain jealousy between Volunteer and Militia officers, and he knew that the Volunteers would be very much opposed o the idea of Militia officers, who, after all, were only Volunteer officers and had not received much more training, being appointed to these posts. Then there was the question of numbers. They had not got such a number of officers in the Regular Army as would make it likely that the Government would strain a point in order to keep these Regular officers going, for there was at present a shortage of 4,139. All the Amendments that had been made to this Bill in their Lordships' House had been designed with the purpose of whole-heartedly backing up Mr. Haldane's scheme, and in resisting the Amendment now before the House their Lordships would be consistent in their efforts to promote efficiency.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE expressed regret that the Government had given no indication of their view towards the far too liberal compromise, from their point of view, which had been offered by the noble Earl Lord Brownlow. He hoped they would hear something from the Government on that point, although, in his opinion, the compromise went a good deal further than their Lordships could with safety accept. He was not in the least frightened by the bogey of the General Staff. They were told that the General Staff were satisfied, and, therefore, their Lordships ought to be satisfied; but, personally, though no one had a higher respect for the General Staff than he had, he thought it would be safer to be guided by the advice of experienced Volunteer officers. At all events, he thought their Lordships should hesitate before they cast aside their practically unanimous advice in favour of the *dictum* that the General Staff were satisfied. He presumed that they might take it that Lord Lucas spoke the mind of the War Office on the point of the staff sergeants, that it was not the intention of the Government to substitute Volunteer staff sergeants. There was no intention of making this change at present, for the new system of training was experimental. But when the change was made it would be one of a far-reaching and most important character. Was it not right, in these circumstances, that Parliament should be consulted when that change was made? If their Lordships insisted upon the Amendment remaining in the Bill they would in no way prejudice the Government of the day three or four years hence coming and saying, "We want to make this change now." Their Lordships would be able to judge of the case as it was presented to them then. The only authorisation for this change was that they must assume that the new scheme of training was to be a success. He was quite ready to admit that if the system of training was an unqualified success they might be able to do away with the Regular adjutants. But it was very doubtful whether it would be a success. He did not himself trust the Government with this power. He thought their Lordships ought to keep the matter in their own hands until it was proved to their satisfaction that the new system of training was a success. He could not congratulate Lord Lucas on the strength of his argument that the staff sergeants could keep up the connection with the Regular Army.

LORD LUCAS said he did not mean that the staff sergeants would keep the connection, but the officers from the training battalions who would be in perpetual touch with the officers of the Territorial Force.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE thought the connection would be kept better by an officer attached permanently to the battalion, as would be the case with the Regular adjutant. No answer whatever had been given to the argument of Lord Salisbury that by this arrangement 390 officers' places were going to be lost to the Regular Army. When it was proved that under the new system of training the Territorial Army was more efficient they would be ready to discuss the matter, but they had at present no such guarantee, and he hoped their Lordships would hesitate before voting with the Under-Secretary in favour of this Amendment.

THE EARL OF MOUNT-EDGCUMBE said that several noble Lords had spoken on behalf of the Yeomanry, but what was true of the Yeomanry was still more true of the Volunteers. He was quite sure that there were a great many Volunteer officers who were very efficient and had a good knowledge of drill and discipline, but the position of a colonel of Volunteers who had not one man with a knowledge of drill and discipline who could give his whole time to these matters would be a very ungrateful one.

*EARL ROBERTS, speaking of his own experience, said he had never heard any commanding officer of Yeomanry, Volunteers, or Militia ask for anything but a Regular officer as adjutant. He sincerely hoped that this change would not be allowed to be made. Considering the extraordinary number of officers that were needed, not less, as he had previously pointed out in this House, than 7,000 on mobilisation, including the requirements of India, he could not conceive anything more detrimental to the interests and position of the Army, especially in India, than to reduce the number of British officers.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: My Lords, I am very anxious not to enter further than I can help into what I may call the purely technical side of this question. My own connection with the Auxiliary Force closed, I am sorry to say, some years ago, and when I was a member of it I think most Auxiliary corps leant more heavily on the crutch, both the colonel commanding and the other officers, than is the case at present. I am quite willing to admit that there has been a very marked and considerable change in that respect. At the same time I do not see how it can possibly be denied that the presence of a purely professional soldier as adjutant in any Territorial or Auxiliary battalion must do something in many cases to check the growth of the spirit of self-reliance among the officers. I am quite certain that that would not apply to the noble Marquess, Lord Salisbury. He, by common repute, is an exceedingly efficient officer, and from all I know of him I am quite certain that all the adjutants in England would not be able to interfere with him to any extent beyond which he wished that interference to go; but I think he has done what people are very apt to do, that is to argue somewhat too exclusively from his own experience. The noble Marquess said, "Why not institute your training battalions if you will, and keep your Regular adjutants still?" I take it there are two answers to that. In the first place, it would involve very considerable extra cost; and, secondly, in the opinion of the military advisers of my right hon. friend the Secretary of State, it would be difficult to define the relations as regards training, supposing the adjutant was still to remain the training officer, between the adjutant and the training battalion. As regards what fell from other noble Lords, it seemed to be assumed that, when the Regular adjutant disappeared, no one was going to take his place. Nothing was said by Lord Zouche or even by the noble and gallant Field Marshal who spoke last about the training battalions. This part of the scheme may be a bad or a good one, but it is not the abandonment of the old practice without the substitution of something in its place. I am afraid that the Government cannot accept Lord Brownlow's suggestion to insert the words "as far as possible," because it would not allow of the gradual substitution of Auxiliary officers in these posts if the system of training battalions succeeds. In order to make it clear that the operation is to be gradual, we would be quite willing to insert after the word "shall" the words "until otherwise decided by the Army Council." But on the whole question of the discussion of this Bill, I desire to make an appeal to noble Lords opposite. It does seem to me a most unusual thing that noble Lords, some of whom are very competent to speak on the merits of the new training scheme, but some of whom, like myself, are no more competent to express an opinion upon it than I am on a question of Chinese grammar, should yet be prepared to give a vote which would upset the carefully-planned and carefully thought-out scheme of those who at present are the military advisers of the Crown. My noble friend Lord Donoughmore said he wanted to leave this to Parliament. I do not think that the Members of this House or the other House are the people who are competent to pronounce technical opinions of that kind. No one pretends that my right hon. friend the Secretary of State has not ascertained the opinions of those who are entitled, as many of your Lordships are, to speak for the Auxiliary Forces; and it is not a wise thing, in the course of a merely casual debate, almost to set aside and really interfere to a serious extent with a scheme at which the military advisers of the Crown have deliberately arrived, and for the success or failure of which His Majesty's Government must, of course, take the responsibility.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I had intended to suggest to the House that we might diminish the rigidity of the section as it now stands by adding after the word "shall" the words suggested by my noble friend Lord Brownlow, "so far as possible," or some words of the same description. Perhaps a better formula would have been "except in special circumstances certified by the general officer commanding." But I gather from what has just fallen from the noble Earl who at this moment leads the House that His Majesty's Government are not prepared to accept any compromise of that kind. Let me assure the noble Earl that our desire is, as his desire no doubt is, to render this Territorial Force as efficient as possible, and we ask ourselves whether we are likely to render it more efficient by adhering to the old practice of taking adjutants and drill instructors from the Regular Army, or by relying upon the new race of adjutants and drill instructors who are to be the product of this new scheme of training, which, of course, has not yet come into existence. That it is really what we are asked to do. We are asked to give up what we have got for something which we may or may not get as events develop. I was struck by the observation of my noble friend Lord Lucas, who, in reply, I think, to a suggestion from the bench behind me, said we might go on with Regular adjutants for a limited period of years. He expressed an anticipation of his own that it might be possible to continue them for a certain number of years, but he distinctly declined to give the House any pledge upon the subject.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: What I think my noble friend said, or at any rate intended to convey, was that the existing state of things would last until it was proved to the satisfaction of the military authorities that the new scheme was succeeding.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: But he told the House that His Majesty's Government were not able to give a pledge.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: That was for a fixed term of years.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: Then I come to the suggestion which was made by the noble Earl the Lord President. He told us, I think, that His Majesty's Government were ready to insert after the word "shall" the words "until otherwise decided by the Army Council." Now that does not quite satisfy the objection which we feel. We desire some more specific security than that, and if the noble Earl will allow the insertion of the words "until otherwise decided by Parliament" we should probably be able to come to terms with him. I desire, before I sit down, merely to add this observation. I have been greatly struck, as I think the House was greatly struck, by the main point in the argument of my noble friend Lord Salisbury, that by getting rid of these adjutants nearly 400 Regular officers will be lost to the Army. That seems to me a very serious matter indeed. The more we consider this question the more we must be impressed by the fact that the shortage in Regular officers is the greatest of all our military difficulties. It was said—and I do not think it was contradicted—that at this moment there was a shortage of something like 4,000 officers. This represents the difference between the strength and the establishment. That is a very serious matter, and the point has been enforced with all the weight which belongs to him by my noble and gallant friend Lord Roberts. Let us remember that for India this question of officers is a vital one. I had the honour of serving in India with the noble and gallant Field Marshal, and I well remember how often he used to impress upon me that with our great Native Army and with its comparatively small allowance of British officers it was absolutely necessary that we should have in reserve as many officers as possible. I believe I am right in saying that the number of officers commissioned every year is somewhere about 800. How many had we to commission at the outset of the South African war? In the first year of the war it was found necessary to commission somewhere about 4,000 British officers. In the face of those facts, I for one, view with the greatest reluctance and apprehension any proposal which will have the effect of diminishing by several hundreds the number of British officers on the establishment. I shall, therefore, vote against the proposal of the Under-Secretary.

On Question, "That the word 'shall' stand part of the clause," their Lordships divided—Contents, 108; Not-Contents, 38.

CONTENTS.

Norfolk, D. (*E. Marshal.*)

Argyll, D.
Bedford, D.
Northumberland, D.
Wellington, D.

Bath, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Salisbury, M.
Zetland, M.

Albermarle, E.
Bathurst, E.
Brownlow, E.
Cathcart, E.
Cawdor, E.
Clarendon, E.
Dartrey, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Dundonald, E.
Egerton, E.
Essex, E.
Fitzwilliam, E.
Haddington, E.
Halsbury, E.
Jersey, E.
Lauderdale, E.
Mar and Kellie, E.
Mayo, E.
Morley, E.
Morton, E.
Mount Edgcumbe, E.
Orford, E.
Plymouth, E.
Powis, E.
Roberts, E.
Romney, E.
Scarbrough, E.
Stradbroke, E.
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry.*)
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller.*]
Westmeath, E.

Churchill, V. [*Teller.*]
Cross, V.
Falmouth, V.
Halifax, V.
Hardinge, V.
Hill, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*)
Iveagh, V.
Knutsford, V.
Milner, V.
Portman, V.
Tredegar, V.

Abinger, L.
Addington, L.
Ardilaun, L.
Armstrong, L.
Atkinson, L.
Avebury, L.
Balfour, L.
Balinhard, L. (*E. Southesk.*)
Barrymore, L.
Blythswood, L.
Bowes, L. (*E. Strathmore and Kinghorn.*)
Brodrick, L. (*V. Midleton.*)
Burton, L.
Carysfort, L. (*E. Carysfort.*)
Clinton, L.
Clonbrock, L.
Colchester, L.
De Mauley, L.
Desborough, L.
Digby, L.
Dunboyne, L.
Ellenborough, L.
Elphinstone, L.
Faber, L.
Forester, L.
Hindlip, L.
Hylton, L.
Kenmare, L. (*E. Kenmare.*)
Kensington, L.
Killanin, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll.*)
Kinnaird, L.
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore.*)
Lawrence, L.
Leigh, L.
Lovat, L.
Monk Bretton, L.
Muskerry, L.
Newton, L.
Oriel, L. (*V. Massereene.*)
Oranmore and Browne, L.
Oxenfoord, L. (*E. Stair.*)
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Raglan, L.
Ranfurly, L. (*E. Ranfurly.*)
Ravensworth, L.
Redesdale, L.
St. Levan, L.
Saltoun, L.
Sanderson, L.
Shute, L. (*V. Barrington.*)
Stalbridge, L.
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran.*)
Tyrone, L. (*M. Waterford.*)
Wynford, L.
Zouche of Haryngworth, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Loreburn, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Crewe, E. (*L. President.*)

Abingdon, E.
Beauchamp, E.
Carrington, E.
Chesterfield, E.
Chichester, E.
Craven, E.
Fortescue, E.
Portsmouth, E.
Temple, E.

Althorp, V. (*L. Chamberlain.*)
Selby, V.

Aberdare, L.
Allendale, L.
Armitstead, L.
Brassey, L.
Burghclere, L.
Castletown, L.
Clifford of Chudleigh, L.
Denman, L. [*Teller.*]
Dunning, L. (*L. Rollo.*)
Elgin, L. (*E. Elgin and Kincardine.*)
Eversley, L.
Glantawe, L.
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*) [*Teller.*]
Hamilton of Dalzell, L.
Haversham, L.
Headley, L.
Joicey, L.
Lucas, L.
Lyveden, L.
Nunburnholme, L.
O'Hagan, L.
Ribblesdale, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Weardale, L.
Welby, L.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I now move to insert after the word "shall" the following qualifying words which I read to the House just now, "except in special circumstances certified by the general officer commanding."

Amendment moved—

"In page 7, line 18, after the word 'shall' to insert the words 'except in special circumstances certified by the general officer commanding.'"—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH accepted the Amendment.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF DUNDONALD, in Clause 7 (First appointments to lowest rank of officers of the Territorial Forces), moved an Amendment providing that such first appointments shall be given to persons recommended by the president of the association for the county "after consultation with the officer commanding the division, whom failing, the officer commanding the brigade to which the unit belongs." He maintained that these officers should be consulted with regard to any vacancy in the units under their command. If the patronage and all the responsibility with regard to appointments of officers were taken out of the hands of high commanders the force would not receive the enthusiastic support of the military element in filling the ranks of officers, and they would not get the right class of officers.

Amendment moved—

"In page 8, line 23, after the word 'county' to insert the words 'after consultation with the officers commanding the brigade to which the unit belongs.'"—(*The Earl of Dundonald.*)

*EARL ROBERTS: I support that Amendment.

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH reminded the House that the appointments with which this Amendment would have to deal were only first commissions, and the Government thought the Amendment was hardly necessary. The importance of consulting the officers suggested would be obvious if previous military training or experience were the question that had to be primarily considered; but, as he had pointed out, the appointments were first commissions, and the president of the Association, together with the officer commanding the unit whom he would normally and the Government supposed ordinarily consult, or would be in the habit of consulting, in view of their local knowledge would be in a perfectly sound position to decide upon the suitability of a candidate for a first commission. That being so, he hoped his noble friend would not consider it necessary to insert the words proposed.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

THE DUKE OF BEDFORD moved to insert in Clause 8 a new subsection providing that the Territorial soldier should be warned before attestation that he might be asked to serve outside the United Kingdom in time of national emergency, and that his attestation paper should contain a certificate that the attesting officer had explained the same to the recruit. During the Committee stage he gathered it to be the intention of the Government to ask the Territorial Force in case of national emergency to serve abroad. Under these conditions it seemed to be only fair and right that the soldier of the Territorial Force should be warned that that request might be made of him, and the right and most convenient moment for that to be done was, he thought, when the Territorial soldier was attested.

Amendment moved—

"In page 9, line1 4, after the word 'time' to insert the following new subsection: '(*d*) Shall be warned before attestation that he may bs asked to serve outside the United Kingdom in time of national emergency, and his attestation paper shall contain a certificate that the attesting officer has explained the same to the recruit.—(*The Duke of Bedford.*)

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH thought the noble Duke was labouring under some misconception as regarded the necessity for a provision of the kind proposed. The Amendment suggested that a recruit for the Territorial Force should be warned before attestation that he might be asked to serve outside the United Kingdom in time of national emergency. It seemed to him to be most inexpedient to insert any such provision in the Bill, nor did it accurately represent what the position of a man in the Territorial Force would be. The Amendment seemed to imply that a man in the Territorial Force could be required to serve outside the United Kingdom. That was not the case. He could only be asked to volunteer to serve outside the United Kingdom, and Clause 12, Subsection (3), expressly provided that a man should not be compelled to make an offer to serve outside the United Kingdom except by his own consent, and that a commanding officer was not to certify any voluntary offer without having previously explained to the person making the offer that it was to be purely voluntary on his part. The Bill as it stood met the objections which the noble Duke under a misconception appeared to think existed. In the opinion of the Government the attestation paper should contain nothing but the legal liabilities implied by attestation, and there was no legal liability in the case of the Territorial Force to serve abroad.

THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND thought the Amendment raised an important point which ought not to be lightly passed over. Was it to be understood—he would not say that no pressure was to be put upon a member of the Territorial Force, but that he was not to be asked, or incited, or induced to offer to serve abroad in time of national emergency? That was really the question. It had been felt to be a hardship by those who engaged merely to serve within the United Kingdom that, although technically and legally they were not bound to serve elsewhere, yet when emergency arose the question was put before them in such a manner that practically they could not refuse to serve abroad. That had been the case hitherto with the Militia. The Militiaman was attested to serve in this country, and yet whenever an important war broke out he had invariably been asked whether he would not serve abroad, and the matter had been put in such a way that the Militiaman had been unable to refuse without there being cast upon him a stigma which he naturally did not wish to bear. He (the Duke of Northumberland) had always felt that it was extremely unfair to gather men together upon one pretext, and then to put before them another proposal, which although legally they might refuse, morally they were bound to accept. The Government should do one of two things: either they should put distinctly in the Bill that no man was to be asked or induced in any way, unless he came forward perfectly voluntarily, to go on foreign service; or if they did not like to do that—and he could see plenty of objections to it—they should tell him fairly that he was liable in time of emergency to be asked so to offer himself.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I am completely in accord with the noble Duke who has just sat down as to the hardship of what may be called compulsory volunteering. It is clearly unfair and improper to range a number of men in line, calling on them as a body to volunteer, and asking those to fall out who do not wish to go abroad. That is an altogether improper kind of pressure to put upon men. But if the noble Duke will look at Clause 12 he will see that while Subsection (2) provides for the acceptance of the offer on the part of the Territorial Force, Subsection (3) attempts to deal with the difficulty which he has referred to, and I venture to think that the proper time to deal with the difficulty is when the offer is made and not at the time of attestation. It seems to me that the Amendment would have the opposite effect to that which the present state of things may be held to induce. If such a provision were inserted it would lead the recruit to suppose that it was exceedingly probable that he would be called upon to serve abroad.

THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND: Is it not so?

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I should have thought that the chances of an individual recruit in the Yeomanry or Volunteers having to serve abroad, taking the average of the last hundred years, was exceedingly slight. Therefore, the Amendment of the Duke of Bedford would, in my opinion, have the effect of making it seem probable that these men would be called upon to serve abroad. I confess that when I first saw the Amendment I could not help thinking that it seemed to be almost founded on the class of question that was put to the Chinamen when they were invited to go to South Africa; a series of explanations had to be made under the Ordinance, and I should be sorry to think that recruits in His Majesty's Auxiliary Forces were to be recruited in that manner.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE said he hesitated to take part in the discussion after the dressing-down which he had been given by the noble Earl opposite, but he could assure him that his desire in joining in the debate was not to force himself upon the noble Earl as a colleague. That was one of the last things he thought of doing. He thought, however, that the moving of the Amendment was amply justified. They had been afraid that it was the intention of the present authorities at the War Office to bring pressure to bear on the members of the Territorial Army in time of national emergency to join the Expeditionary Force. Their fears were partly grounded on a sentence in a memorandum on Army Reform which was presented to Parliament by the Secretary of State for War on 30th July, 1906. In that document the right hon. Gentleman, when speaking of the desirability of improving the organisation of the Auxiliary Forces, said—

> "It is certain that if the mind of the nation is concentrated on the defence of its own interests, it will, if it is made possible for it by adequate preparation to do so, pour out in case of necessity very substantial numbers for the expansion as well as the support of the Expeditionary Army."

He thought that sentence justified them in being nervous on the point, but the noble Earl, he would not say had given a pledge, but had expressed the opinion of the Government that they did not regard with favour the system of compulsory volunteering that had existed in the past. He hoped, therefore, the noble Duke would not feel it necessary to press his Amendment to a division.

LORD RAGLAN pointed out that the Subsection of Clause 12, on which the War Office appeared to rely to make all things perfectly clear to the intending recruit for the Territorial Army, was practically word for word the orders which had always been sent out whenever the Militia had been called upon to volunteer for foreign service. He would put it to His Majesty's Government whether it was not high time that they were honest with recruits. For a great number of years this country had obtained the bulk of its recruits by fraud—by pretending to get them by voluntary service but practically getting them by compulsion. He had always had a very strong feeling against that method of enlisting men for one special form of service and then asking them to volunteer for another which they had not contemplated at the time of enlistment. He hoped the Government, if they could not see their way to accept the Amendment would at any rate insert words, or in some other way make it clear that a recruit at the time of his enlistment should thoroughly understand the obligations he was taking upon himself.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

THE EARL OF FORTESCUE moved to insert in Clause 16 a new subsection, the object of which, he explained, was to enable the Territorial Forces, if embodied, to be billeted otherwise than in public-houses. The present law of billeting dated from the time of the Petition of Rights and the days of Charles II., when it was considered necessary to protect citizens in their households from the brutal and licentious soldiery. Even a good many years after that Dr. Johnson spoke of the billeting of a Life Guardsman upon them as one of the greatest calamities that could befall a household. But things had changed a good deal since then; the character of the Army was very different, and the men of the Territorial Force would differ from the rest of the population only in the fact that they had a rather higher standard of self-sacrifice and patriotism. If the Force was embodied, there would be the proverbial three courses open to the Government of the day. They could billet the men, as at present, in public-houses, or they could put them under canvas, or they might legislate in a hurry for power to billet them in private houses. The first course could be put aside. The numbers might be anything from 250,000 to 900,000, and it would not be easy to find room for such a number in public-houses even if public-houses were in the places where the men were wanted. Then to put men under canvas and horses in the open in the winter months was to expose both to unnecessary hardship and to render a good many men and horses ineffective through sickness. The only alternative was to billet them in private houses, and if that course was likely to be forced upon the Government of the day when the time of emergency arose, it was surely better to provide for it in advance and give them time to make arrangements beforehand, because things that were done in a hurry were generally done badly.

Amendment moved—

"In page 14, line 38, after the word 'force' to insert the following new subsection:—'(4) It shall be lawful when the Territorial Force or any part of it is embodied, to billet the officers, men, and horses belonging to it on other premises than those licensed for the sale of intoxicating liquors.'"—(*Earl Fortescue.*)

LORD LOVAT thought it was quite certain that great evils would occur if the men on embodiment were billeted in public-houses. The question would not arise in time of peace; it would be only during the excitement of war, when the value of the citizen soldier would go up a hundred-fold, and everybody was ready to provide him with either whiskey or beer according to whether he was in England or in Scotland. His own regiment had suffered under the calamity of having to be billeted in the town of Southampton for a few days, and he could assure the noble Earl that there was the greatest difficulty, not in preventing men getting at the drink, but in keeping civilians from giving them drink, especially when they were billeted in public-houses. When the liquor was served in the house where the men were actually staying it was practically an impossibility to keep them from it. As to putting the men under canvas, there were not sufficient tents in Great Britain at the present time to billet the whole of the men if they were called out. Therefore, the only alternative seemed to be to legislate in a hurry, in order that the men might be billeted in private houses. That being so, he thought the Amendment was a most reasonable one.

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH had no doubt there was a good deal to be said from the temperance point of view against soldiers being billeted in public-houses. He had known many cases in which they had been so billeted and there had been no intemperance or difficulty. It was quite impossible for the Government to accept the Amendment, which raised a very large constitutional question. It practically authorised the billeting of men of the Territorial Force in private houses, and that was a proposal which the Government could not accept on the Report stage of a Bill of this kind.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY agreed that the Amendment raised a very important point, and it might be that the noble Earl had not had sufficient time to consider all its bearings. It was a very remarkable condition of the law that they could only billet men in public-houses. It must undoubtedly lead to a very regrettable state of things where men were not of a class who were able to resist the kind of temptation which a public-house held out to them. He had had some little experience in the matter, because during recruit training of a Militia battalion which did not drill upon enlistment, but had preliminary drill, the men were very often lodged in or allocated to various public-houses, and it was not a good arrangement. But he felt the force of the noble Earl's objection, and if he would rather have a little time to reflect upon it he was sure his noble friend would not desire to press the Amendment at that stage.

LORD RAGLAN pointed out that the whole pivot on which the training of the Territorial Force would revolve was the six months on the outbreak of war. It was perfectly impossible for the Territorial Force or any considerable portion of it to receive anything like that period of training, as there was nowhere to put the men. The matter from the point of view of billeting was becoming worse every day. The number of public-houses was being largely decreased, and ideas as to cubic space and so forth, which nobody cared anything about a few years ago, had become very important. He remembered the time when the Militia in his county slept two in a bed and the men were crammed in as close as they could get the beds into the room. That sort of thing would not be permitted nowadays. He hoped the Government would give the matter their careful consideration.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I hope, in view of the history of billeting in this country, noble Lords will think twice before they endeavour to insert such a proposal as that contained in the Amendment, under which a military force might be compulsorily billeted in the private houses of the people of this country. In view of the history of billeting and the significance of a proposal of this kind in the Bill under consideration, I hope your Lordships will pause before you accept the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

THE DUKE OF BEDFORD moved a new subsection making it lawful for a Secretary of State to call out any portion of the Territorial Army to aid the civil power in the preservation of peace. He explained that he had understood from the noble Earl the Under-Secretary for War that it would be possible for the soldiers of the Territorial Force to be used in aid of the civil power, but he could not find it anywhere stated in the Bill. It seemed to him to be a matter of great importance upon which there should be no doubt. Therefore, he moved the insertion of this subsection.

Amendment moved—

"In page 14, line 38, after the word 'Force' to insert the following new subsection :—'(4) It shall be lawful for a Secretary of State at any time when occasion appears to require to call out any portion or any of the men belonging to the Territorial Army to aid the civil power in the preservation of peace.' "—(*The Duke of Bedford.*)

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH was glad to have the opportunity of removing a misunderstanding which seemed to have arisen in regard to this matter. He did not know exactly how the wrong impression arose. All he knew was that several Questions were asked him from different parts of the House, and it was just possible that in replying to a double Question he might have given an affirmative reply in regard to this matter which he really meant to apply to another part of the Question. It never had been and it never could be the intention of the Government to render the Territorial Force liable as a force—that was the point—to be called out in aid of the civil power. Their intention was that the force in this respect should be on exactly the same footing as the Volunteers. The expediency of employing not fully disciplined troops in the suppression of riot, which, of course, would result from this Amendment, was in the view of the Government open to very grave doubt. If the Territorial Force ought to be used, or could be used, or if it was the intention of the Government themselves that it should be used for that purpose, it must in their opinion be made subject to military law whilst being so used. [A NOBLE LORD: Hear, hear!] But the Amendment of the noble Duke did not effect that. Moreover, if the men of the Territorial Force were to be called out for the suppression of riot, the duty of calling them out would from the very necessity of the case have to be entrusted to magistrates and not to the Secretary of State. That again was a power which he thought they ought to guard with extreme jealousy. The mischief might have been wrought long before the Secretary of State could be communicated with or his orders communicated to the members of the force. The Bill in making no provision with respect to this matter placed the Territorial Force in precisely the same position with respect to the suppression of riots as that in which the Volunteers were placed under the law as it now stood. Under the existing law the Volunteers, like any other citizens, could individually be called upon to aid the civil power in the suppression of riot, but they could not be used as a military body for that purpose unless possibly they happened at the time to be called out on active service or were otherwise subject to military law. The Government were firmly convinced that that was the only satisfactory course to pursue. For these reasons it was impossible to accept the Amendment.

*THE EARL OF SCARBROUGH reminded the noble Earl that the Yeomanry under present conditions were allowed to volunteer their services to aid the civil power if required, and he asked whether that liberty would be withdrawn from the cavalry of the Territorial Force.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: May I be allowed to say that every one is entitled to support the civil power? The position of a soldier is precisely the same as that of any other person in this country with regard to supporting the civil power. If your Lordships desire to read an interesting statement of the law on that subject you will find it in the Report on the Featherstone riots.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

LORD MONTAGU OF BEAULIEU moved an Amendment to Clause 22 providing that field officers of the Territorial Army should not be required to serve in the office of High Sheriff. He said that the matter was referred to on the Committee stage, and as the Government promised to look into the question, perhaps the Lord President could now state the decision they had arrived at.

Amendment moved—

"In page 17, line 11, after the word 'jury' to insert the words 'and field officers of the Territorial Army shall not be required to serve in the office of high sheriff.'"—(*Lord Montagu of Beaulieu.*)

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I am glad to be able to meet the noble Lord upon this point. He desires that field officers of the Territorial Army should not be required to serve in the office of High Sheriff. The Government are quite prepared to agree to that. Of course, the noble Lord understands that it only applies to officers of substantive rank who are actually employed, and that honorary officers and officers of brevet rank are not included.

LORD MONTAGU OF BEAULIEU: I quite understand that.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH moved an Amendment to Clause 27 providing that every such Order in Council as was therein referred to should be laid before both Houses of Parliament. He explained that Clause 36 appeared to apply only to Orders in Council required by this Act to be laid before Parliament, and during the Committee stage the Earl of Donoughmore suggested that as Parliament ought to have an opportunity of considering Orders in Council made under this clause, the insertion of these words was necessary, and a pledge was given in regard to the matter. In order to give effect to that pledge, he now moved the insertion of these words.

Amendment moved—

"In page 20, line 7, after the word 'Volunteers,' to insert the words, 'and every such Order in Council shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament.'"—(*The Earl of Portsmouth.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH moved to omit from Clause 28 the following paragraph:—"For continuing to any person or the holder of any office previously entitled thereto the right of recommending for first appointments or any other special privilege enjoyed as respects any unit dealt with by the Order." He explained that it was a technical matter, the object of the paragraph being to provide for the preservation of certain rights of the Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports. As, however, the Militia under the new scheme would not be transferred to the Territorial Force the paragraph was no longer necessary and would only be misleading.

Amendment moved—

"In page 21, line 20, to leave out Paragraph (f)."—(*The Earl of Portsmouth*).

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH moved to leave out from Subsection 4, which ran as follows: "Every Order in Council made under this section shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament as soon as may be after it is made," the words "as soon as may be after it is made." He explained that it was necessary that the words should be left out, inasmuch as Clause 36 specified the time within which Orders in Council were to be laid before Parliament.

Amendment moved—

"In page 21, lines 29 and 30, to leave out the words 'as soon as may be after it is made.'" (*The Earl of Portsmouth*).

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE DUKE OF BEDFORD moved to insert in Clause 29 the following new subsection:—"(1) The application of the provisions of Part III. of this Act to the

Militia shall be deferred for a period of two years." This Amendment, he said, embodied a suggestion which he ventured to make to His Majesty's Government during the Committee stage of the Bill, namely, to exempt the Militia from the operation of the Bill for a short period. He now suggested that the period in question should be two years. The object of his Amendment was to avoid the disadvantages which were inseparable from a simultaneous derangement of all the existing Auxiliary Forces at the same moment. The Amendment, if accepted, would leave the Militia system intact and would continue the Militia force as a military force in being, while the Territorial Army was in process of formation. Our Militia system had never failed the country in the hour of need, and it offered a sound and solid foundation for construction. At one time His Majesty's Government were rather inclined to build on that foundation, but they finally decided in favour of the Territorial Army. If that Territorial Army was to be the success which all their Lordships desired, it would certainly require the whole attention of the Army Council during the next few years. It was true that by a stroke of the pen they could change the name of the Volunteer Force into Territorial Army, but no feat of penmanship would enable them, first to fill, the ranks of that army with officers and men, and secondly, to create the County Associations save in imagination and on paper. The officers and men, the infantry and artillery, of the Territorial Army were to be derived in the first instance from the Volunteer forces. He would like to draw the attention of their Lordships to the present condition of the Volunteer Forces. In the last annual Return for the year 1906, the strength of the force—the number of men actually serving—was given at 255,854. The Territorial Army, excluding cavalry, would require 275,000, and for that number 9,528 officers would be required. There were at present, however, only 8,369 officers in the Volunteer Forces. Therefore, if every officer in the Volunteer Forces were to transfer to the Territorial Army, they would require 1,159 officers and 19,146 men to make up the establishment of the infantry and artillery for the Territorial Army. That was by no means all, for out of the 255,854 Volunteers, 8,782 were returned as non-efficient. In 1905, a partial medical examination of the Volunteer Forces showed that 30,000 men were medically unfit for service. As there were some 30,000 men medically unfit for service, some 9,000 non-efficient, and also 19,000 deficient, they reached a total of 58,000 men who would be required to complete the establishment of the Territorial Army. He would remind their Lordships, however, that all the Volunteer officers and all the Volunteers now serving were not at all likely to transfer to the Territorial Army. He thought it was not making too big an estimate to say that about 25,000 men would drop out on transfer, so that they really arrived at a figure of 83,000 required for the Territorial Army. As there was a shortage of 1,159 officers in the Volunteers, even if all transferred, he thought they might assume that 1,500 officers and 83,000 men would be required to bring the existing Volunteer force up to the requirement of the Territorial Army. Was His Majesty's Government going to hold the Associations responsible for finding these officers and men? He quoted the figure of 25,000 men as being a probable number who would drop out on transfer, but as a matter of fact 15,698 had already gone since last year. He had asked his Majesty's Government if they could lay on the Table of the House a Return showing the strength of the Volunteers in the month of July. Unfortunately they were not able to do that, but they had supplied him with the strength for the month of April last, and the figures showed a decrease in numbers of 15,698. He would like to know if it was still impossible for the noble Earl the Under-Secretary for War to say anything as to the strength of the Volunteer force during the present month. His own impression was that the returns must be in the War Office, and with the present Bill before the country he should have thought that those returns might have been rather interesting reading. He was quite sure that all connected with the County Associations would do their very best to make them a success, but all the same, if they had to start to make up 1,500 officers and 83,000 men it would be a pretty hard task. It was not a thing which could be done in a few months, but it would take a few years. That His Majesty's Government should consider that these associations were capable of that achievement showed what a high opinion they had formed of the bodies to whom they proposed to delegate the responsibility. Perhaps, however, they were going a little too fast. These associations were not yet created. It would take some little time to create them and to start them with their work. In large and populous counties, such as Lancashire, Yorkshire, Midlothian, or Middlesex, it would be a matter of very great complexity. The War Office had no experience in dealing with county and borough councils, and any undue hustling of the local authorities might lead to friction which, if the scheme was to be a success, ought, if possible, to be carefully avoided. As regards the War Office itself, it would have plenty to do if it was efficiently to maintain the Army as it was to-day; but if there was to be added to that the formation of these associations and the creation of the Territorial Army, and in addition to that the recasting of the whole Militia, the task would be an overwhelming one and they would run a very great risk of failure. With regard to the Militia, he had put a large number of Questions to the representatives of His Majesty's Government in their Lordships' House during the last fortnight, and the absolute inability of His Majesty's Government to give the House any very satisfactory explanations or Answers had been seen. He was sure that the Army Council had not yet had time to consider the Militia and the special service section at all. He did not think they had any idea of how they were going to deal with it, and on that point alone he thought there was a good plea for a little delay. But His Majesty's Government were organising, so far as he understood, for war at any moment and not for peace at any price. Should the calamity of war come upon us in the course of the next two years, when the associations were in a chaotic condition and when the Territorial Army was but a mere paper expression, if His Majesty's Government had left the Militia system intact, if they had left the Militia force in being, then at any rate the Militia could render them the same service that it did during the South African War, when its numerical contribution to the purposes of the war was in excess of that made by the Yeomanry, the Volunteers, and the over-seas contingents together. On the point of the promptitude with which the Militia could be utilised for foreign service, he would remind their Lordships that the South African War began during the second week in October and before the last week in November the 3rd Loyal North Lancashire Regiment was on its way to Malta, whence it was sent on to South Africa. If His Majesty's Government put the Militia Force into the melting pot there must be a clear time when there would be no organisation, no officers, and no men. He anticipated that the objection on the part of His Majesty's Government to leaving the Militia as it was, would be that since the Militia were not now enlisted in exactly the form for foreign service which the War Office required the force was useless and ought to be removed. He submitted that there was no force whatsoever in that argument, because, if the calamity of war came upon us in the next two years, of course the men in the Militia would accept any special form of drafting which the circumstances of the moment demanded and was likely to add to the safety of the country. His Majesty's Government had got the men now: Why should they not leave them as they were? He admitted at once that if they could transfer the whole of the Militia by Army Order to the Army Reserve he would have nothing more to say. But that was precisely what His Majesty's Government could not do. To attempt to do it in a hurry, to force the men against their will into the Special Reserve would, he was sure, end in disaster. They would not get the men. He thought they would get the 20,000 boys, but they were no good for the purpose for which the Government wanted men—that was for foreign service. The War Office, he believed, would run the risk—as a matter of fact the thing was almost a certainty—of losing about 70,000 men. He thought that the Regular Army would suffer greatly from the formation of this special service branch. He found that in 1906 the waste from the Army was 46,414. The number of recruits was 36,465 only, and of those 12,409 came from the Militia. The proposal now was to give all the Militiamen £2 to transfer to the Special Reserve, and then they were not to join the colours for the space of one year. If that had been done in 1906 His Majesty's Government would have had the waste from the Army of 46,414 men, and an intake of only 24,056 men, showing a deficit of 23,000 recruits, because they would have got no recruits at all from the Militia. This would really be the case next year if His Majesty's Government formed this Special Reserve; and if a deficiency of 23,000 recruits did not upset the Regular Army, he did not know what would do. It was known that many of the Militia would be averse to accepting precisely the same forms of service which they found pressed hardly on them—and in their opinion unfairly—during the South African War, and which he feared, in too many cases, proved their ruin when they came back to civil life. In addition to that, there was the element of breaking faith with all the men in the Militia force. His Majesty's Government had a perfect right to discharge any man in the Militia, because he always enlisted for six years or for so long as his services were required; but it was a very different thing if His Majesty's Government took that power and used it to break the conditions of service of the men in the Militia. Last year certain experiments were conducted in regard to training in the Militia. He himself made a special appeal to the patriotism of his county and got a most satisfactory answer. A good lot of recruits were forthcoming, and all those men joined, as they believed, for six years under certain conditions as regarded enlistment, pay, and training. He himself had always considered that those conditions were just as much binding on the Government as they were on the men, but now it was found that the whole of those conditions were to be suddenly and violently changed. Men were to be asked to undertake conditions of service far more serious than they had ever, contemplated, and for less remuneration. That was an object lesson which, he was afraid, the men would take to heart, and he feared that after it the men would be very shy in future of entering into any new contract of service. The Government pinned their faith on the magic of the £2 bounty. He knew well the value of bounties from a recruiting point of view. But he hated the system, because in plain language it meant that they went with money in their hand to a man, in this case a poor man, and tempted him to accept conditions of service from which they know he would keep free, and, if he was the sole breadwinner of his family, ought to keep free, were it not for the bribe with which they tempted him under the name of bounty. His Majesty's Government had determined that they must organise on two lines instead of three. His suggestion was that they should wait until their first line was ready to take the place of their second line. It was not ready now and it could not be ready for several years. In the meantime they should leave their second line, their Militia organisation, as at present, and under the Militia Act of 1882, for a period of two years. During those two years they should by all means enlist the Militia for foreign service or embodiment, but they should not deprive the men of that immunity from drafting which was theirs by Act of Parliament and to which they attached special importance. They should certainly during that period go on amalgamating those Militia battalions which they wanted to amalgamate, and finally lead up to the solution of the problem of drafting individual men into the line in time of war. If they gave the Militia more control over their recruiting he was sure that the force would not melt away in the interval of two years, but it was absolutely essential that it should be left under the Act of 1882. In conclusion, this was what he understood: His Majesty's Government had reduced the Regular Army by 20,000 men, and 1,000 non-commissioned officers and several hundred officers. They proposed to destroy absolutely and entirely the whole Militia system which had been so useful in the past. They might retain 20,000 boys at a cost of £40,000, but, even if they did, these boys would be of no use for the purpose for which men were wanted immediately, and His Majesty's Government would run the risk, amounting almost to a certainty, of losing 70,000 men. The whole situation was to be saved by the Territorial Army, which did not yet exist, and for which he calculated His Majesty's Government would require about 1,500 officers and 83,000 men. These were to be supplied by the County Associations which were not yet created. The fact of the matter was there was a great deal of destruction in the scheme of His Majesty's Government, but the construction was excessively vague. Possibly their Lordships would remember a scene in Shakespeare's play, "King Henry IV.," representing a council of war held at Bangor to plan an invasion of England. The Welsh prince, Owen Glendower, was greatly pressed by his colleagues to reveal to them his military resources. He declined to do that, but military resources were no trouble to him, because he announced to the company that he could always summon spirits from the vasty deep. There was present, however, one Hotspur, who was not a very tractable man, and his reply was: "So can I, and so can any man, but will they come when you call them?" His Majesty's Government might summon territorial forces from the void, but would they come when called? His Majesty's Government were responsible that they should. They hoped they would, but whilst waiting he trusted that the Government would agree that they would do well to retain the Militia system of service intact and the Militia as a military force in being for the brief period of two years.

Amendment moved—

"In page 21, at the beginning of line 33, to insert as a new subsection, '(1) The application of the provisions of Part III. of this Act to the Militia shall be deferred for a period of two years.'"—(*The Duke of Bedford.*)

VISCOUNT HARDINGE wished to associate himself with what the Duke of Bedford had said. He desired to express a hope that His Majesty's Government would see their way to come to an agreement of some sort with the proposal indicated in the Amendment of his noble friend, and defer changing the present *status* of the Militia for a period of two years, by which time they would be able to know for certain whether or not the Territorial Army was going to come into being, and thereby give the country the force required for home defence. Further, they would then be in a better position to know whether the Militia were ready to transfer *en bloc* and undertake the new obligations. The proposal of his noble friend appeared to him, as it must do to many others, to be the only rational policy to adopt under the circumstances, for he very much doubted if there were any people, or, if any, very few, who really believed that this Territorial or speculative Force would ever develop into that fighting machine which the Secretary of State for War had foreshadowed. Nevertheless, they must not shut their eyes as to what had been done during the time that His Majesty's Government had been in power. What had been done]? The Secretary of State for War had greatly reduced the artillery and had wiped off by a stroke of the pen many fine and efficient regiments, thereby considerably reducing the numbers of the Army Reserve. What he would like to know was, how did His Majesty's Government expect to make up this deficiency? It was apparently to be done by transferring that of the Militia battalions to the Special Reserve. To many people such a proposition as that would appear to be an easy solution of a difficult military problem, but he would like to ask whether anybody, be he a Militia commanding officer or a member of the Army Council, could say for certain that the Militia, officers and men, were prepared to undertake the new responsibilities which were demanded of them. As his noble friend Lord Salisbury very rightly said the other day, it was idle to suppose that the men of the Militia were going to undertake these responsibilities, and at the same time be put pecuniarily in a worse position than they had hitherto occupied. Up to now they had received an annual bounty of £4 10s., and now it was proposed to pay them only £4. For this reason, if for no other, he ventured to think that the proposal as indicated in the Amendment of the noble Duke was a sound and statesmanlike one—far more judicious, in fact, than that of the Secretary for War, who, in his judgment, was taking a leap in the dark. The Under-Secretary for War, when making his statement with regard to the Militia the other day, and when relating the so-called concessions to the Militia, carefully avoided reference to the questions put to him by the noble Duke. The first of these questions was: How were His Majesty's Government, having abolished the Militia, in future to get from 15,000 to 20,000 recruits, which for many years past they had got from the Militia, to go into the Regular Army? As the noble Duke very aptly said, unless the Government could show they had a certain solution for that puzzle this scheme must inevitably fail. He trusted, therefore, that the noble Earl, the Under-Secretary for War, would enlighten the House on these points, for it seemed to him it was impossible to discuss the scheme unless they had that information. There were other points on which they wanted information with regard to the Militia. They were told the other day by the Under-Secretary for War that owing to the recent decision of the Army Council the functions of the third and fourth battalions were to be analogous, but at the same time they were led to believe that the strength of the establishments would be considerably reduced. He would point out that at the present time they had not been told what the establishments of these battalions were to be. Many of them were strong in numbers at the present time, and if they were reduced they ought to know in what manner they were to be reduced to the normal establishment. The concessions proposed for the officers in the Militia, he must admit, were very reasonable, and he thought as regarded many of the commanding officers there was not at the present time any just cause of complaint. But here again the Militia officers required further information, for they had never been told what would be the order of precedence as regarded seniority of the officers of the first and second battalions. Also they had yet to learn what inducement was to be given to officers of the Line to serve in the third and fourth battalions, for they had yet to learn that the Army at the present time was over-officered. After what had been said it passed his comprehension to discover where these officers from the Line battalions were to come from. He did not take part in the debate with regard to Line officers being adjutants to the Volunteer battalions, but he understood Lord Lucas to say it would not be necessary to have these Line officers because the Volunteers would be so well trained at their depots. It seemed to him, however, that in the case of a big county it would be impossible for those officers to look after all the Volunteer battalions, so that he did not see that there was any argument in that as regarded the training battalions. If, however, the Government did not see their way to agree with the noble Duke's Amendment, which was to give them a further grace of two years to tide over the transition period, which must be a period of military weakness to this country, it was absolutely essential that the functions of the Militia, both officers and men, should be more clearly defined than they were at the present time, for they wanted to know what the future really was to be. Whatever that future might be he would most urgently press the point that if the Line was to be dependent on the Militia in time of emergency it was essential that the Militia should be thoroughly trained in musketry. The only way to do that was to give them careful musketry instruction during the recruit training. Then when a trained Militiaman went up for his annual course he must have proper musketry training such as he got now, which was six days' preliminary drill and six days' shooting. That was the only way in his opinion in which a man could get to know the shooting of his rifle. He trusted, therefore, the Army Council would pause before making this drastic change, and would give the Militia the same musketry course as they had at present. In his opinion, and in the opinion of many commanding officers, if they reduced that musketry to six days it would have a disastrous effect on the future efficiency of the Militia. There could be very little doubt that the great uncertainty of the future of the Militia had had a most discouraging effect for many years on that force, and, although people accused some of the Militia regiments of not being so efficient as they might be, he was perfectly sure it was because they had not been properly treated. If better treatment were accorded them than in the past the Militia would readily agree to give loyal support to any scheme which His Majesty's Government might produce, provided it was not unduly rash, and that they were definitely told what their duties were to be.

*VISCOUNT MIDLETON thought that nobody could doubt from the speeches to which they had listened that there was a genuine desire on that side of the House and on the part of Militia officers to make the scheme of His Majesty's Government a success. If he might venture to sayso, he differed from some noble Lords who had spoken as if the provisions of the measure relating to the Territorial Army were the most important in the Bill. In his judgment, if the Army remained under the conditions proposed by the Bill, the Militia Force, and not the Territorial Army, was the pivot of the Bill. They had seen in recent years, and allusion had been made to it from the cross benches two or three times that night, a great change in the attitude of the country towards the Regular Army. It had been a matter of grave concern to those who, like himself, were responsible members of the late Government during a period of the South African war to see that the Regular Army had suffered so heavily as it had done owing to the operations of the last two years. The more he reflected on the manner in which the Army had decreased in strength—a decrease he would venture to tell their Lordships, with a full sense of responsibility, which would not enable His Majesty's Government to meet the demands in time of peace for drafts—the more he was concerned, the more concerned in fact must any man be who had given his mind to the problem, as to the condition of the force who were to replace the 20,000 or 30,000 troops. That force was not the Territorial Army, but the Militia Force. It could not be a Party question, it could not be merely a Militia question, as to whether or not they were going to obtain that which the Secretary of State for War desired and was requisite if he was to mobilise the Army at all in case of war. They had two problems put before them. They had the original suggestion of the Government that the Militia should practically disappear and that a new force should be formed in its place. That he thought was happily abandoned in the House of Commons, and they had instead of it the proposal that the Militia *cadres* should be largely made the substratum of the new force. Then they had the proposal of the noble Duke, who spoke with great authority on this question, and who had pointed out that it was of importance that the Militiaman should agree to accept this new liability. What were they asking the Militiaman to do? He had heard and read so many speeches in the last few weeks in which it was held that some great concession had been made to the Militia in allowing them to engage for foreign service, in allowing them to go into the front line at all instead of putting them back to serve in the Territorial Army, as to make him wonder sometimes if the authorities at the War Office realised what they were asking these men to undertake. They were not asking every man in the Militia to turn out for a month's drill and then to be embodied to defend his own country, not forcing him to move from these shores unless he desired it, but they were asking him to go abroad on the outbreak of war, not even in all cases with his own officers. What were His Majesty's Government giving him for it? They gave the Army Reservist £9 a year to undertake to serve for four years after he had left the colours. If he took on after that they gave him £6 a year. But to the Militiaman, who was a man in regular employment, and very often married, who had to leave everything at the call of His Majesty's Government under the new *régime*, they offered £2 in one bonus paid down and nothing else for services which might cause him to spend two or three years on garrison duty under a tropical sun in India. So far from looking at it from the point of view of concessions to the Militia, he looked on it in the gravest apprehensions, lest from a *nuance* of feeling expressed in that House they should make a mistake, because once they put it in the minds of the Militia that the offer was not substantially good, the result would be that instead of having 70,000 or 80,000 men, they might get but 10,000 or 12,000 men to perform the duty. That was why he urged His Majesty's Government most carefully to consider all the points which the noble Duke and the noble Viscount had put before them. From his own personal experience he believed that nothing at all could be done with the Militia except through the colonel and the other officers when they were embodied. He ventured to say that if His Majesty's Government wrote letters to the whole of the Militia to-morrow, asking them to undertake a certain liability, even if the offer was a first rate one, in a larger number of cases they would not get answers. The Militia were not under military law, and they were extremely suspicious. They would not be aware that they were practically to go as a body and with the officers in whom they had confidence and with the comrades whom they knew. He most seriously feared—and he was only repeating the views of men who had spent nearly all their lives in the Militia and some of whom were sitting behind him—that if His Majesty's Government took the steps of practically dissolving the present Militia after this training, and inviting the men to take this new liability without calling them together, they would lose a number of men whose services they would not be able to regain by any means. It was from that standpoint that he approached the Amendment of the noble Duke. His noble friend asked for two years. He (Viscount Midleton) agreed very much with what fell from Viscount Hardinge when he said that the Militia had suffered terribly—cruelly he would say, from the indecision of the last few years. Perhaps they had all had some share in causing that indecision, but, however it might have been brought about, he submitted to the noble Duke whether to keep that indecision going on for another two years would not practically be in itself a blow at the force, and whether he could not attain the end which they all had in view of obtaining from the Militia the largest possible number of men who were willing to serve in the front line of the Army on mobilisation without giving so long a *moratorium* as two years. A possible outlet had occurred to his mind. Could not His Majesty's Government meet his noble friend on this question? Could they not say: "We recognise that we are not merely proposing to ask the special contingent to serve as a force in its own units and with its own traditions, but are proposing in addition to draw from the force the number of men whom we require to reinforce the line as far as possible in companies with their own officers"? That being so could not His Majesty's Government say, "We will deal with them in the first place in units"? He did not believe that the noble Duke's Amendment providing for a *moratorium* of two years would hamper the intentions of the Government in regard to the Bill in a single particular. It would not prevent the Secretary of State the day after the Bill passed, setting to work to amalgamate Militia regiments which were too weak, or which for some other reason he desired to deal with as one battalion instead of two. It would not prevent the enlistment of men under the Bill for the special contingent with the new liabilities, and therefore it would not prevent the Secretary of State ceasing to recruit under the old conditions. All the Amendment did say was that, of the two points of view, the one of acting without regard to the Militia officers and without embodiment and the other of acting in concert with the Militia officers at the time of training as was suggested by the noble Duke, the latter, and as he thought, the more prudent, course should be adopted. Could not the Government, desiring to go forward, adopt the noble Duke's Amendment limiting the period of grace for the Militia to one training instead of to two as he had proposed? It might be that it was not necessary to put words into the Bill to that effect and that a Parliamentary undertaking might be given which would have the full force of anything that His Majesty's Government could put into the Bill. But His Majesty's Government should not run astray concerning the serious dilemma in which they would be involved by supposing that merely by giving the go-by to the advice of the Militia officers, they could obtain something which they would not otherwise be able to do. It was very encouraging that when he (Viscount Midleton) had to endeavour to get the men of the Militia to give a service, the like of which no body of volunteers had been asked to render before, the response was extremely satisfactory. He was referring to the time when, after the first Militia regiments had volunteered for the Transvaal, when in fact they were near the end of the war, when the terms of the service were well understood, and when the long, dull, and wearisome life which the Militia had to lead in the Transvaal was well known, he had to induce twenty or thirty new regiments to go out at the end of 1901 to replace the first regiments. The Government of the day had released a certain number of regiments which had been embodied and sent them back to their homes. The question arose at the War Office how they were to induce a certain number of the Militia regiments to volunteer. There were no two opinions either among the officers on the headquarters staff or among the Militia officers who were called in to help that if the Government of the day made appeals to any of these men without first embodying them, they would not be so successful as if they dealt with them in a mass and under the influence of their own officers. It was recognised that under such circumstances there would be no chance of persuading the men to take this great liability upon themselves, and for that reason he (Viscount Midleton) sanctioned the Commander-in-Chief's proposal to embody a number of Militia regiments in order to ask them whether they would undertake the liability, the understanding being that if they did not do so, they should be sent back to their homes. That course was only adopted with the object of dealing with the men under conditions which were likely to induce them to take a patriotic line. That was all that he urged on His Majesty's Government that night. Let them undertake that there should be no disturbance of the existing terms until after the next training had enabled the Militia officers to communicate with their own men, and proceed, as far as was necessary, with the formation of the special contingent outside the existing Militia. He assured His Majesty's Government that in advice which was offered them from that side of the House, he and his noble friends had no desire to hamper the scheme.

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH thought that before replying to the appeal made by his noble friend opposite he ought to explain why it was impossible for his Majesty's Government to accept the Amendment in the form in which it was proposed by the noble Duke. He could only endorse very strongly the spirit of the speech of Viscount Midleton, when he said he did not think that in any part of the House there was any desire or intention to act otherwise than in a friendly manner towards the Militia. At the same time, as he said when he moved the Second Reading of the Bill, the first and supreme duty of His Majesty's Government was their responsibility to the Army itself, and they could not possibly accept the Amendment of his noble friend because, practically, the effect of it would be, if it was to extend over a period of two years, that during that time they would have left upon their hands a large body of men—he would take them at their present strength of 90,000—for whom they really would not have any use at all. They could not be employed in the Territorial Force and they could not be employed in the special contingent. He wished it to be clearly understood that His Majesty's Government looked upon the formation of the special contingent as a matter of the most urgent, vital, and pressing importance. They intended to recruit for that contingent at once, and they considered that the contingent was absolutely necessary for the effectiveness of the expeditionary force. He said that because he wished to assure the noble Duke opposite and all who belonged to the Militia that if His Majesty's Government could have done so they would most willingly have accepted the Amendment in the form in which it was proposed. He had now to deal with the suggestion made to him by his noble friend Viscount Midleton, who had asked whether it would not be possible that His Majesty's Government should give their Lordships a Parliamentary undertaking that the existing Militia infantry and engineers should have a *moratorium* of a year; that was to say, that they should remain in their present position until after next summer. If he had to consider any proposal of that kind seriously, he should only do so on the distinct and definite understanding that the noble Duke and all those who acted with him were really anxious to assist the Government in their scheme, and all they asked was that they should have an opportunity of explaining matters and of being brought into touch with their own men. He was bound to say that the noble Lord had given a definite assurance that he and those who acted with him were really anxious to make the scheme a success. He wanted to be assured that if a *moratorium* was granted it would not be used in an obstructive way, but with a genuine intention of explaining to their men the new conditions of service. If the Government were to give an undertaking on this matter, it must be on the understanding that this proposal of a *moratorium* only applied to the 101 battalions which they proposed to transfer to the special contingent. It must also be clearly understood that if an undertaking was given his noble friend would withdraw his Amendment. He was prepared, if it once and for all would settle the position of matters and would be accepted by noble Lords opposite in the spirit in which it was made, to give a Parliamentary undertaking that, in order to enable the Militia commanding officers to explain more fully to their officers and men the new conditions of service in the special contingent, the existing Militia should not be asked to transfer until after the Militia training next summer. It must be clearly understood that recruiting for the Militia would be stopped as soon as the Bill was passed, and that recruits after that date would only be enlisted into the special contingent, which must be started, from the supreme exigencies of our military policy, as soon as the Bill became law.

*VISCOUNT MIDLETON: Will the recruits of the special contingent drill with the Militia?

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH said he was afraid he should not like to give an answer on that point offhand. That was a question of administration and it would have to be considered hereafter. He wished to point out to the noble Duke that if he pressed his Amendment, in all human probability the effect of it upon the Militia Force would be very unsatisfactory, because, as Viscount Midleton had pointed out, it would again leave the whole position of that force in a very unsettled condition. The Militia, in fact, would still be in a state of unrest as to what its duties were to be. He would also remind the noble Duke that if the Amendment were pressed, the War Office would be placed in an extremely difficult position, for they would have thrown upon their hands a large body of men whom they could not utilise in their scheme and the Militia and the special contingent would then exist concurrently. Financial considerations must inevitably prohibit the maintenance of these two forces simultaneously, and under those conditions there could be no possible doubt that the Army Council would decide to foster the special contingent. If the Amendment were pressed, it would probably be found impossible to give the Militia their annual training, and their recruiting would probably also have to be stopped, as leaving it open would only diminish the supply of recruits for the special contingent. As to the bonus, he still thought, although there might be objections on social grounds to the whole principle of bonuses, if the Amendment was pressed, it was extremely probable that the Army Council would find it necessary to invite Militiamen to accept the £2 bonus to transfer to the special contingent. There was another point. The concessions made during the passage of the Bill through Parliament in order to make the transfer of the Militia to the special contingent more in accordance with their traditional feelings were made on the distinct understanding that the Militia would transfer and become the nucleus of the special contingent. But if this was to be postponed for two years that would not happen.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I do not know whether the noble Earl means to say there was any understanding as far as we, who sit on these benches, are concerned?

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH said he only meant an understanding in the minds of His Majesty's Government.

He was not aware that there had been any understanding with the Front Bench opposite, but there had been a distinct understanding on the part of His Majesty's Government. As a matter of fact, His Majesty's Government could not have done what they had done unless they had understood that they would have the Militia. If they were to take this suggested period of two years it was almost certain that the Militia would be very largely depleted, because they would have in existence the third battalions of infantry, which they would have to raise for the special contingent, and training brigades of artillery with their own *cadres*; and Militia officers would, under those circumstances, hardly expect the same consideration as was now allowed to them. If he accepted the suggestion of his noble friend Viscount Midleton, he did so in all good faith and on the understanding which he had mentioned that it was to allow Militia commanding officers time to explain to their men the new conditions of service. Further it must be on the understanding that His Majesty's Government could honourably rely on the assistance of noble Lords opposite who were in command of Militia battalions to help them in meeting the difficulties which always beset any great change.

EARL BATHURST said he was sorry to hear that the Under-Secretary of State for War could not accept the Amendment. He spoke as a Militia officer, and as a commanding officer of some years service. He hoped he had had some experience during that time. When it came to the suggestion made by the noble Viscount on the Front Opposition Bench that the two years should be reduced to one year he could not agree with him. So much was this the case, that he would rather the Amendment had referred to three years instead of two. It was quite obvious that any great reforms in the Army could not be carried out all at once. He thought the Secretary for War, when he first started on his scheme, believed that he would be able to draw up one large scheme and carry it through Parliament and make an enormous change in the Army and Reserve Forces. That was not so easy as it appeared. It was a question of time. They could not make these great changes all at once, and he thought it would have been better if the right hon. Gentleman had had his scheme clearly in his head, and had set to work quietly to make these changes gradually. He thought it was for this reason that the noble Duke had proposed his Amendment, so that the changes intended in the Territorial Army might be carried out, but that in the case of any unforseen circumstances the country would still have the Militia force to fall back upon. The Militia had been taunted with the fact that they were short of numbers, and Mr. Haldane's Territorial Army scheme had already had a bad effect in that direction. He knew for certain that there were a great many men at the end of the spring training who refused to re-engage because they did not know what was going to happen. They did not know whether they would form part of the Territorial Army, or whether they would be amalgamated in the third and fourth battalions. They did not like the uncertainty, and so they refused to re-enlist. He believed the whole object of this Bill was to reduce the expenditure on the Auxiliary Forces, and he thought that was the whole object of the annual training being reduced from twenty-seven to fifteen days. He would like his noble friend opposite to put himself in the position of a commanding officer of Militia at the present time. They were told that these battalions were to be trained for fifteen days, and that they were to do six days musketry, but it was rather uncertain now when the latter would be performed. It had been suggested that the six days should take place in some cases at the beginning and in other cases at the end of the training. In the fifteen days there must be two Sundays, and if there were added six days at the beginning of the training there would be another Sunday. Supposing some men turned up for musketry—and it was not easy to see when they were coming—at the beginning of the training, they would have only four days in which to do their musketry. The same thing applied to those men who stayed till the end of the training; they would have done fifteen days annual training, and they would have in addition these six days for musketry. In those six days another Sunday came in, and a day must be taken off for the men to go home, so that only four days were left for musketry practice. They had heard in the last few years how very necessary it was that the musketry of our Army and Reserve Forces should be improved. How was its efficiency to be increased if only four days' practice were possible? If his noble friend opposite were a commanding officer of Militia how would he regard the point? Supposing he were a keen officer and wished to see his battalion increase in efficiency every year, he would at once see that under this scheme the efficiency would decline.

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: Is the noble Lord speaking to his own Amendment?

EARL BATHURST said he was speaking to the Amendment of the noble Duke, and for the reason that he hoped the Militia would be allowed to have two years grace and permitted to go on just the same as they had been doing in the past while the Territorial Army was brought into some kind of order. He was not content with the undertaking given by the Government that the Militia should be allowed one year's grace. He would like to see the undertaking which the noble Earl had proposed put in black and white in the Bill. Nothing less would satisfy him, and for that reason he begged to support the Amendment.

*LORD ABINGER supported the Amendment, and said he was glad to see that at all events the Under-Secretary for War had fully realised the object with which the proposal was put on the Paper, He thought it would be patent to all Militia officers both inside and outside the House that the object of the Amendment was to strengthen the hands of the Government. It had been put on the Paper in order that the why and wherefore of the changes that were to be brought about might be explained to the Militiamen. This was a question for the men and for the men themselves. He recollected that the noble Duke said a few days ago in Committee that the men would require to have the new system of the special contingent explained to them. There were certain things in the Bill which had required some little explanation. They must remember that the Militiamen had not the advantage of the extremely lucid explanations of the Under-Secretary for War. They on that side of the House thought that these two years would go far to strengthen the hands of the Government in that it would allow time to explain to the Militiaman the conditions under which his service would be given in the future. Over the whole of the debate there had hung a sort of shadow and the shadow was that of the Army Council. The representatives of the Government had asked them several times, whether it was a question of the Militia, of the Volunteers, or a good many other things, to trust that splendid body of men the Army Council. All that the Opposition asked His Majesty's Government to do was to trust the Militia officers who were serving to-day. If they were given the opportunity they would explain the conditions to the men who were serving under them. If the Government stopped recruiting for the Militia and immediately brought in this special service contingent system the Militiaman would be suspicious, and the £2 bonus held out as a bait before his eyes would not tempt him to transfer. For this reason he supported the Amendment of the noble Duke as to the two years, believing that that was the minimum period which ought to be allowed.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said the noble Earl the Under-Secretary for War had just now stated that on behalf of the Government he had made concessions upon a certain understanding. He hoped the noble Earl would forgive him for having interrupted when he said that, because if he had not interrupted, many of their Lordships, he thought, would have supposed that there had been some understanding as between the two sides of the House that these concessions of His Majesty's Government were conditional upon a certain attitude on the part of themselves. The noble Earl frankly said at once that there was no such understanding. That was so, and he did not want to argue these matters conditionally. Their patriotism was not conditional.

He might tell the noble Earl that the attitude which they would adopt did not depend in any degree on the attitude of His Majesty's Government. They would be patriotic, he hoped, whatever His Majesty's Government might do. In the same way he rather hoped that the concessions His Majesty's Government had given them had not been conditional. He had rather flattered himself that it was the strong force of their arguments which had convinced His Majesty's Government, and that they had arrived at the conclusion that the concessions had to be made not as a matter of bargain or of arrangement, but because the suggestions they put forward were at any rate in those particulars better than the suggestions which His Majesty's Government themselves had made. That was the point of view from which he approached the consideration of the present Amendment. There were two proposals before the House. There was the proposal made by his noble friend the Duke of Bedford in the Amendment upon the Paper, and there was the suggestion indicated by his noble friend Lord Midleton in the course of his speech. The main difference between these two proposals was the difference of time. The noble Duke proposed that the *moratorium* should be two years and his noble friend Lord Midleton proposed that it should be one year—that was to say until the end of the next training. If he could show that that was really the only difference between them surely there was an opportunity to come to an agreement, and he thought it was the only difference. Something had been said about recruiting for the special contingent and for the Militia during the next recruiting season. There was no difference between the proposal of his noble friend Viscount Midleton and the proposal of the noble Duke on that head, because there was nothing in the noble Duke's Amendment which affected recruiting one way or the other. The noble Duke had proposed that Part III. of the Bill should not apply to the Militia for two years. That would not prevent, even if they passed it exactly in the form in which the noble Duke had proposed it, the Government putting a stop to Militia recruiting and going on with special contingent recruiting. Similarly the proposal made by his hon. friend Lord Midleton did not affect recruiting; it proposed only that so far as existing Militiamen were concerned there should be a *moratorium* until next year. So that in that respect so far as he had gone he had shown, he thought conclusively, that the only difference between the two proposals was a difference of time. There was, however, one other difference—the difference between having it on the face of the Bill, as it would be if the noble Duke's Amendment were passed, and of having it as an assurance from the Government, which would be the form it would take supposing the course suggested by Lord Midleton were followed. Was that a distinction which it was worth while spending much time about? He confessed he did not think it was. He did not understand why the Government objected to putting it into the Bill. He had always thought that if a thing was going to be done—he did not doubt the word of the Government on the matter—it should be done formally, and it could not be damaged by putting it on the face of the Bill. It appeared to him however that the Government, by giving an assurance across the Table of the House, would be absolutely pledged as men of honour. Really, the matter was not worth discussing one way or the other so long as they had a perfectly distinct assurance. Let them be perfectly precise as to what would be done supposing Lord Midleton's suggestion were adopted and they received an assurance from the Government that they would carry it out. He understood that supposing that course were adopted the Under-Secretary for War was prepared to say that it should be applied to the 101 battalions. That was very good. To be quite precise, the noble Earl said something about the balance of the Militia battalions, and that it was not to apply to them. He thought that was a mistake. He thought it should apply to them. By all means let the Government, if they wished, amalgamate the weak battalions with the strong as they proposed to do. There was nothing to prevent them from doing that, but there was no reason in the world why a distinction in this respect should be made between men now belonging to the 101 battalions and men belonging to the balance of the battalions. They ought to be treated on the same footing and not to be destroyed until after the next training. There was one other little point on which he was not quite clear. What latitude did the Government take with regard to the men who would be enlisted in the special contingent? The obvious plan was that these men enlisted for the special contingent during the next recruiting season should be attached to the Militia battalions which would be still in being, and should be trained with them until the final moment arrived when the Act came into full force. When the point as to the two years was cleared up they would at any rate have a precise statement on which they could act. There remained this question which did not appear to matter very much: either this arrangement was to be on the face of the Bill or an assurance was to be given by the Government. It was worth this one observation: if they got an assurance from the Government now it could never be retired from; it was absolutely binding. If, however, they placed it on the face of the Bill and the Bill went back to the House of Commons, what would happen to it there it was not for him or anyone sitting with him to say. Whether that would have any effect on his noble friends in coming to a decision he could not say, but he had a rather strong opinion himself as to which would be the better course of the two.

LORD RAGLAN regretted that the noble Earl the Under-Secretary for War had not seen his way to carry out a promise which he made on the Committee stage of the Bill, to furnish complete answers to many questions which were addressed to him. There were five or six questions regarding which he wrote some time ago to the noble Earl, asking if he would be good enough to supply an explanation. As no explanation had yet come from him, the only conclusion he could come to was that the information was not to be found in the War Office.

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: If the noble Lord refers to a private letter which he addressed to me, I am happy to tell him that I have answers to all the points which he mentioned and I will send them to him to-morrow.

LORD RAGLAN was sorry that the noble Earl had not seen his way to give the information before, as it might have shortened the debate. There was one point in particular on which he wished for an answer, namely, whether these new conditions had yet been put to any Militia battalion, and, if so, what response had been received in regard to them. He was informed that several Militia battalions had been communicated with on the subject, and perhaps the noble Earl the Under-Secretary for War would be able to give the House some information on the point. There was another point to which he wished to draw attention. The noble Earl kept on saying that they had Militiamen whom they could not utilise in any war. He (Lord Raglan) could only reflect on what an amazingly short memory the War Office had. The late Government were able to utilise about 100,000 Militia in the South African war. There was no use, therefore, in going about wringing their hands and asking what were they to do with 90,000 men. Whatever steps His Majesty's Government took, the Militia would be ready to volunteer for foreign service, if they were wanted. The noble Duke, the Duke of Bedford, and others of his noble friends, had explained very fully the extraordinary difficulty—almost the impossibility—of getting from individual Militiamen any answer regarding their willingness to accept the new conditions, unless they were called up for training. He thought it was easy to see why that should be the case. The average Militiaman was not ready with his pen, and to write a letter accepting or refusing conditions of service was a thing absolutely beyond his capabilities. Militiamen, and men of that class of life, were particularly cautious about putting their names to paper at all. They looked very much askance even when asked to sign their accounts. Therefore, the notion that His Majesty's Government could write 90,000 letters and receive 90,000 beautifully written answers by return of post made one think that any person who suggested such a thing could have absolutely no idea of the class of men with whom they were dealing. There was one point that he wished to impress upon His Majesty's Government. It was a very serious thing to break faith with men, and faith had been broken with a large body of Militia submarine miners. These men had been disbanded and the officers had been kept in the Army List as a kind of Engineer reserve. These men had no legal claim against the Government, but they certainly appeared to have the strongest possible moral claim. He had en-endeavoured to enlist some of these men in his own regiment, but they said, "No, thanks; we have had enough of soldiering after the way in which we have been treated." That, in his opinion, was a very short-sighted way of dealing with men. Those who belonged to the recruiting class were not rapturously attached to the War Office. They were suspicious of changes, and to proceed to disband these men scattered over the coasts in the South of England at a time when it was important that they should not frighten off the recruit-giving class was not a wise thing to do. As regarded the bounty proposed to be given to Militiamen to induce them to transfer, he wished to urge the War Office to consider most carefully whether they could not see their way to alter it. His Majesty's Government were proposing to give men £2 to undertake this liability, and they proposed subsequently to take it away from them by instalments of 10s. a year. It was most extraordinary short-sightedness for the sake of 10s. a year to give a check throughout the recruiting class. If they deprived a man of the 10s. bounty when he thought he ought to get 30s. they would disgust the whole body of men. It was not a large amount, and he most earnestly impressed upon the War Office the vast importance of not altering a sum which the men had been used to for many years. It took a long time for the news of any improvement in the conditions of service, pecuniary or otherwise, to filter through to the recruit-giving class, and if His Majesty's Government altered these conditions for the worse, it would inevitably cause an immense falling off in recruiting. Coming to the noble Duke's Amendment, he could not say how strongly he felt the vast importance of the proposal. His Majesty's Government were going to put our entire military forces into the melting pot. Everybody believed with regard to the Yeomanry that the class of men who joined would alter for the worse, and in all probability the number would be reduced. Nobody had much doubt that the same kind of thing must inevitably happen to the Volunteers, and at the same time His Majesty's Government were going fundamentally to change the principles on which the Militia force was based without giving the Militiamen themselves a fair opportunity of saying whether they would come into the scheme or not. The noble Earl the Under-Secretary for War had used an expression that night which if he had been brought up as a soldier he would not have done. The commanding officers of Militia battalions were asked by him to undertake to use their best endeavours to get the men to embrace the new conditions of service. He would point out that as a Militiaman and a soldier, a commanding officer, however much he might approve or disapprove of a measure of this kind, if ordered to put its provisions into effect would feel bound to carry out his instructions as a duty. It was his duty to do what he was told, and he would undoubtedly do it. Militia commanding officers would explain to their men the advantages they would obtain and the liabilities they would be subject to under the new scheme, and he trusted that in some way they would be relieved from the difficulty of asking their men to undertake liabilities that they were not required to undertake themselves, as he looked on that duty with very great dread. These matters, however, affected him personally very little as his time was nearly up. He would complete his extended period of command next February, and he thought after thirty-two years of command in one regiment or another it was time he retired to make room for somebody else. He thought the War Office might take to heart the fact that the Royal Engineer officers, being intelligent men, had been willing to be persuaded by the Militia engineers that it was absolutely essential that the latter should go abroad in their own units and under their own officers. He trusted the War Office would realise that if they wanted Militiamen to transfer into this new force it would have to be done in the way that had been suggested, and therefore the question of the transfer should be deferred until after the period of the next annual training. He ventured to suggest to his noble friend the Duke of Bedford that he should be satisfied with one year of grace, and that the House should receive from the noble Earl the Under-Secretary for War a distinct undertaking that the conditions of the existing Militia force should in no way be changed until after the next training.

EARL CAWDOR thought they were not very far from a compromise on this important question, and that it might be settled without the necessity for a division. He could testify from nearly forty years service in the Militia to the grave difficulty of asking Militiamen to undertake any duty which they did not clearly understand. That was a difficulty they wanted to avoid. Whether they avoid it by allowing one year or two years grace was to him a matter of absolute indifference so long as they did avoid it. The Under-Secretary for War had told them that if the Government agreed to give them one year's grace they would still be obliged, because of the necessities of the service, to stop Militia recruiting, and at once begin recruiting for the special contingent. He did not question that that might be necessary, but assuming that to be the view of the Army Council could the noble Earl tell them where would those recruits be trained? Were they to be dissevered from their Militia units, or were they to be trained with those units during the next period of training? He would also like to know whether the noble Earl could give them any assurance that during the year's grace there would be no disturbance of the men of the Militia units other than those included in the 101 battalions which had been referred to. Those were two points to which those who had studied the subject attached a good deal of weight, and he thought if they could be cleared up the way would be paved for an amicable settlement. What they really wanted to secure was that time should be allowed for Militiamen to have explained to them exactly the terms and conditions of service which it was proposed to impose upon them. He would suggest that one year was sufficient for that, and if they could get an assurance from His Majesty's Government that one year would be allowed he would venture to counsel his noble friends that they had better be satisfied with that rather than strive after two years and perhaps get nothing.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I think the House will have been impressed by the very reasonable manner in which the plea for some delay has been urged by the speakers on the other side of the House. It is no doubt perfectly true that it is desirable to have a certain *moratorium* in order that commanding officers and officers generally may be able to explain to their battalions the changes in the conditions of service contemplated under this Bill. Bearing that in mind we have been glad to endeavour to meet the views expressed by Viscount Midleton. It certainly did seem to us that explanation being the object, one training, as I think was granted by the noble Earl who has just spoken, ought to be sufficient for that purpuse. If you cannot explain to the men and they do not understand and do not appreciate or do not agree with what is proposed in the course of one training you are not much more likely I am afraid to impress it on their minds in two. On that ground and with the natural desire we have to set the whole ultimate system starting on its wheels as soon as we can we greatly prefer the proposition of the noble Viscount to that of the noble Duke. I can quite believe after what fell from Lord Raglan and others that they might have preferred the original proposition, yet they would be willing —I will not say to compromise, because the noble Marquess dislikes the word—to come to a decision on those terms. As regards the two questions put to me by the noble Earl who has just sat down, he will understand that I cannot speak as an expert and therefore I am only able to give him a somewhat qualified answer—the kind of answer I am afraid which almost always must be given when the responsible Minister is not in the particular House where the answer has to be made. It is undoubtedly the case that it is desirable that the recruiting for the special contingent should begin at once and that after the Bill becomes law there shall be no further recruiting for the Militia as such. As regards the question of training I conceive it to be the desire and intention of my right hon. friend that these men should be trained with the Militia and not apart from them. But I do not want to give an absolute pledge on that point, as noble Lords opposite will understand, because I am not in a position to know whether in some cases there might be military difficulties in doing so. I think however I may say that that is the object my right hon. friend has in view. As regards the other battalions, those not belonging to the 101 battalions, the period of extension does not entirely apply, because these battalions are not going to form part of the special contingent and there is therefore not the same necessity for explaining the situation to them as there is in the case of the other battalions. I conceive therefore that such dispositions in the way of amalgamation as the War Office may desire to make will proceed at once without delay, and that the proceedings which it has always been understood would take place in regard to these battalions would proceed as contemplated. Those battalions do not form part of the special contingent and therefore no alteration would take place in the original plan contemplated in regard to them.

THE DUKE OF BEDFORD: Do I understand that His Majesty's Government are prepared to give us a distinct assurance that the provisions of Part III. of this Bill shall not apply to the Militia for a period of one year?

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: Yes, until after the next training. That will be one year.

THE DUKE OF BEDFORD: If that is so, I beg leave to withdraw my Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

EARL BATHURST moved to insert after the word "training" the words "which shall include musketry training." He said that he had put down the Amendment with the object of trying to elicit from the noble Earl the Under-Secretary for War what it was proposed to do in regard to musketry in connection with the annual training of the special reserve. He would like to know if the noble Earl could tell them how the six days were to be occupied, how many rounds were to be fired, and whether he thought that the general efficiency in musketry could be kept up during that short time?

Amendment moved—

"In page 22, line 11, after the word 'training' to insert the words 'which shall include musketry training.'"—(*Earl Bathurst.*)

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH said the intention was that the Infantry special reserve would annually undergo a course of musketry, but no Amendment was necessary for that purpose, as the word "training" was, they were told, sufficiently wide to include musketry training. The objection he had to the Amendment of his noble friend was that the effect if it were inserted would be that every man of the special contingent who was called out for training would be obliged to undergo a course of musketry every year. The special contingent referred to in the clause would comprise a large number of men such as Artillerymen, doctors, members of the Army Service Corps, and others to whom it was not intended to give annual musketry training. He hoped therefore that his noble friend would not press for the insertion of the words, because it would be rather ridiculous to apply it to that class of men, and the words as they stood in the Bill would be quite sufficient to cover the case.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY could not help thinking his noble friend would be very much disappointed that the Under-Secretary for War had not availed himself of the opportunity to clear up some of the difficulties which surrounded this question. He wished to press two points on the Under-Secretary. He did not contest the objection which the noble Earl had taken to the verbal Amendment. It was quite true that they did not intend to teach all the doctors musketry every year, but that the

Infantry Militia, or what would correspond to the Militia, ought to have musketry training every year he did not entertain any doubt whatever. He understood that His Majesty's Government went that length, and he earnestly hoped that they would think better of their plan of allowing only the very limited period of six days for musketry. Six days was always too short, and might be absolutely ridiculous. It was always too short as they knew from what happened in their own experience. They could not do the present Militia musketry under nine days, even if they violated the rules of the service; that was the shortest possible time that it could be done in. On the occasion of the last training of his regiment he took twelve days. Under the Government's scheme this special contingent was expected to be ready on the outbreak of war to fight in the first line, and he wished to know how it was that they could do that with less annual musketry training than was provided for the ordinary Militiaman. Could not the Government see what an absurd position they would be placed in as regards these men, supposing there were three or possibly six wet days during the musketry training —and there were wet days in England? He assured the Government that they must embrace the full logic of the position, and if these were expected to be fit to fight immediately war broke out they must be thoroughly trained in the use of the rifle, the weapon with which they would have to fight. He knew it was said that they were going to have a long preliminary training, in the course of which they would learn musketry. He had nothing to say against a preliminary training of that kind, but—though in some respects it was better—it was not the same thing as an annual training. A long training was better because the men could reach a higher point of proficiency, but it was not the same as an annual training because in a long preliminary training they did not remind a man of the work he had done and refresh his memory each year, as in the case of an annual training. Supposing they enlisted a man for six years and gave him a thoroughly efficient preliminary training at the beginning: if he afterwards re-engaged for two successive periods of four years, how much of the preliminary musketry training would be effective at the end of the fourteen years unless in the meantime he had been properly kept up to date? He thought he had said enough to show the Government that the six days was an absurdity. The six days ought not to be separate from the annual training, but ought, on every ground of convenience which could be named, to be part of it. A great deal of time was occupied in the assembling of these forces, and if the Government intended to have musketry training separate from the annual training it would mean a waste of two days. If very bad weather prevailed during the musketry training and it was part of the annual training, time which would otherwise have been devoted to drill would be absorbed by musketry training, which was the more important of the two. But if the men were only to have six days musketry training, no margin whatever was allowed. That margin, which in the interests of efficiency he believed to be a necessity, could only be got by merging the musketry training in the annual training. He earnestly hoped that His Majesty's Government would not be so unwise as to ignore the views of expert Militia officers as to how musketry training could best be given.

Lord RAGLAN said that in discussing this matter the question of expense should not be overlooked. It should be clear to everyone that if the musketry training and the annual training were continuous there would be only one journey on the part of the men to be paid for, whereas if the two trainings took place at different periods there would, of course, be two journeys to pay for. Another important point which His Majesty's Government should bear in mind was that a man should, as far as possible, be put through his musketry course by the officers and non-commissioned officers of his own company, under whom the best results were most likely to be achieved. It should also be remembered that an officer got a better knowledge of his men during musketry practice than in any other way. It was of the greatest importance to keep a man up to his annual musketry practice.

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH said he could assure their Lordships that the matters which had been brought forward would be most carefully considered, but he was afraid he could not give any definite pledges on the points raised across the floor of the House.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH moved a new subsection which, he explained, was proposed to meet a point raised by the Marquess of Salisbury.

Amendment moved—

"In page 22, line 25, after the word 'effect' to insert the following new subsection:—'(5) A special reservist who enlists into the Regular Forces shall upon such enlistment be deemed to be discharged from the Army Reserve.'"—(*The Earl of Portsmouth.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 24, line 9, to leave out the word 'Act, 1882,' and to insert the words 'Acts 1882 to 1906.'"—(*The Earl of Portsmouth.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY moved an Amendment to the proviso. He said that he had given the Government private notice of this Amendment and he understood that it would be accepted. At the present time it was left to the officer or man to indicate his objection to the transfer. It had occurred to him that the provision was hardly satisfactory, because it was not at all likely that many of the men would know what was going on at the time and would not be in a position to indicate whether they objected to the transfer or not. In his opinion the burden ought to be placed the other way, and there ought to be no transfer unless a man indicated his assent. He was glad to think that the Government also took that view.

Amendment moved—

"In line 11, to leave out the word 'if,' and to insert the word 'unless.' In line 12, to leave out the words from 'transfer' to the end of the line, and to insert the words 'indicates his consent to such transfer certified by the commanding officer.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: I accept this Amendment.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In line 13, after the word 'service' to insert the following new subsection: '(3) All Orders in Council made under this section shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament.'"—(*The Earl of Portsmouth.*)

*VISCOUNT MIDLETON recognised the importance of the step His Majesty's Government had taken in including all orders and schemes under the new Order in Council procedure in Clause 36. He thought when he (Viscount Midleton) spoke in Committee on this subject, the Lord President was under the impression that he proposed something new, but there were distinct precedents which he was able to quote to the House with the result that he thought the Lord President was afterwards aware of the facts. He wished entirely to guard himself from proposing that this should be a precedent generally for Acts of Parliament. The Army had been treated differently from almost any other service in that it had been governed by Acts of Parliament which could not up to the present as a rule be departed from in any way, except by Act of Parliament. The power of the Executive over the Army had been limited by that power of referring to Parliament. Therefore, it seemed reasonable when such very large powers were given to the Executive by this Bill that those powers should be subject to review by Parliament in the shape of Orders in Council. He had pressed His Majesty's Government to adopt that course, and he was glad that they had been good enough to agree to it. It was only due to them to say that there would be no endeavour on that side of the House to make this a general proviso in the case of other Acts of Parliament.

THE EARL OF CREWE: The House may possibly remember that when I spoke for the Government on the Committee Stage I took rather strong exception to the form of the Amendment, and am afraid that I somewhat overstated the case in saying that it was unprecedented. It was, I find, not unprecedented, because the same thing occurs in three previous Acts of Parliament, all, however, relating to judicial matters; but it is unprecedented as regards ordinary Acts of administration, The last occasion on which it was applied, I think, was more than thirty years ago, but at the same time I repeat that I did overstate the case in saying that there was no precedent for it. We are quite willing to admit that the case of the Army may also stand on a somewhat different footing from ordinary methods of administration. As the noble Viscount has said, Parliament has always looked with a certain amount of jealousy upon the idea of giving excessive scope to the Executive in matters connected with the Army. I hope and trust it will be clearly understood, and it ought to be placed on record, that this should not be regarded as any precedent for dealing with future Orders in Council. I am speaking quite as much on behalf of noble Lords opposite as on behalf of His Majesty's Government, because whenever they find their way back to these benches they would be of opinion as we are that the whole system of Orders in Council ought not to be treated as one in which the Orders are liable to be laid on the Table with a view to discussion and possible annulment when once passed. We are anxious to guard against it being supposed that Orders in Council, after having received the sanction of the Sovereign, ought as a rule to be the subject of discussion in Parliament. I am glad that we have come to a perfect agreement in the matter, and I quite recognise the reasonableness of the course which the noble Viscount has pursued.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendments moved—

"In page 24, line 25, after the word 'council' to insert the words 'or scheme.'"

"In page 24, line 31, to leave out the words 'on which the said House shall have sat.'"

"In page 24, line 32, to leave out the words 'rule or order,' and to insert the words 'order or scheme.'"

"In page 24, line 33, after the word 'order' to insert the words 'or scheme.'"—(*The Earl of Portsmouth.*)

On Question, Amendments agreed to.

*THE EARL OF JERSEY moved a new subsection which he said spoke for itself. He should perhaps explain that the Trophy Tax was a tax which had been levied in the City of London for the purpose of the Royal London Militia Regiment. It had the good fortune of always being cheerfully paid as long as it was used for that particular purpose.

Amendment moved—

"In page 25, line 29, after the word 'Southampton' to insert the following new subsection: '(5) Nothing of this Act shall affect the raising and levying of the Trophy Tax as heretofore in the City of London, but the proceeds of the tax so levied may be applied by His Majesty's Commissioners of Lieutenancy for the City of London, if the Royal London Militia Battalion is reconstituted as a battalion of the Army Reserve, for any purposes connected with that battalion, and may also, if His Majesty's Commissioners of Lieutenancy for the City of London in their discretion see fit, be applied for the purposes of any of the powers and duties of the association of the City of London under this Act.'"

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH said that he accepted the Amendment.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill to be read 3ª on Tuesday next, and to be printed as amended. (No. 122.)

LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS BILL.

Read 3ª (according to Order) with the Amendments; and passed, and returned to the Commons.

BRITISH NORTH AMERICA BILL.

Read 3ª (according to Order) with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

House adjourned at ten minutes past Eleven o'clock, to Monday next, half-past Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 18th July, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 1) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow.

Ashton-under-Lyne, Stalybridge, and Dukinfield (District) Waterworks Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [Lords] (King's Consent signified). Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Sheffield Corporation Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; a Clause added; Bill to be read the third time.

York (Micklegate Strays) Bill [Lords] (by Order). Read a second time, and committed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill. Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 2) Bill [Lords]. Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

Selsey Water Bill [Lords]; Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill [Lords]. Reported, with an Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Electric Supply Corporation Bill [Lords]. Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Bill to be read the third time.

Alton Military Hospital Bill [Lords]. Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time.

Pasley Children Legitimisation Bill [Lords], reported, with an Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to, Penrith Urban District Council Bill, with Amendments.

PETITIONS.

CONGO FREE STATE.

Petition from Manchester, for protection of the Native Races; to lie upon the Table.

LAND VALUES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Perth, against; to lie upon the Table.

WEEKLY REST-DAY BILL.

Petition from Kilburn and other places, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 12th June; *Mr. Lloyd-George*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 257.]

COUNTY COURTS (PLAINTS AND SITTINGS.)

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 9th July; *Mr. Herbert Samuel*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 258.]

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL PARCEL POST).

Copy presented, of the Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 8) Warrant, 1907, dated 29th June, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3860 and 3861 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BRUNEI.

Copy presented, of Report on the State of Brunei for 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copy presented, of Report, No. 528 (Bermuda, Annual Report for 1906) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVAL PRIZE MONEY.

Account presented, showing the Receipt and Expenditure of Naval Prize, Bounty, Salvage, and other Moneys between the 1st April, 1906, and 31st March, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 259.]

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Caledonian Canal, Copy of One hundred and second Report of the Commissioners [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 260.]

HARBOUR, ETC., BILLS.

Copy ordered, "of the Report of the Board of Trade on the Birkenhead Corporation Water Bill [Lords]."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George*).

CIVIL SERVANTS (RETIREMENT AT THE AGE OF SIXTY-FIVE).

Copy ordered, "of Treasury Minute, dated the 17th day of July, 1907, stating the circumstances under which certain Civil Servants have been retained in the Service after they have attained the age of sixty-five; and of the Return therein referred to."—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Kenmare Rural Postmen.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to the case of Michael Shea, who has acted as rural postman between Kenmare and Bonane for twenty-four years and six months, and who has sent in his replies to questions submitted for superannuation purposes seven weeks ago but has not yet received any further notification; and whether the case will be dealt with immediately, as he has no other means of support since he was relieved of his duty through age and infirmity.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I am making inquiries in the matter. In the meantime I will see if any payment can be made to Shea pending a settlement of the question whether he is eligible for any award under the Superannuation Acts.

Birmingham Telegraph Staff.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether, seeing that on 15th May, 1906, he stated that he was considering a scheme for the separation of the Birmingham telegraph staff from the postal staff, and in view of the inconveniences suffered by the junior members of the telegraph staff, he will state when the scheme promised fourteen months ago will be published and put into execution.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The staff of male sorting clerks and telegraphists at Birmingham has been definitely divided between the postal and telegraph sides of the office. Of course an officer attached to the telegraph side of the office is liable to be called upon to work on the postal side, or *vice versa*, if the exigencies of the service require it.

Boy Clerks.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will consider the advisability, in view of the importance of the points raised in the memorial which has been before the Treasury since September last, by the boy clerks in His Majesty's Civil Service, as to whether a more efficient and economical system could be devised for recruiting the clerical ranks, of referring these questions to a committee of Members of this House.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I do not think the course suggested by the hon. Member necessary or desirable.

Foreign Weights and Measures.

MR. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will remind the Foreign consuls to give, in English equivalents, the statistics as to weights, measures, and coinage which are contained in their Reports.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) British consular officers abroad are already instructed in the sense of the hon. Member's Question, and in all cases where these instructions are neglected the attention of the consular officer is drawn to the matter.

Crime in Ceylon.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he has received representations from the Governor of Ceylon regarding the deportation of persons guilty of serious crime and of the increase in late years of the number of cases of murder and homicide; and whether he will lay upon the Table copies of correspondence on the subject.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) No representations on this subject have been received within the last two years. Correspondence which passed between the late Secretary of State and the Governor of Ceylon has recently been laid before the Legislative Council, and a copy will be placed in the Library of this House. It is not proposed to lay Papers upon the Table.

St. Helena Prisoners.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that on arrival at St. Helena the Zulu prisoners were in an emaciated condition and looked half-starved, and some of them were hardly able to walk; whether amongst these is the chief Tilonko, from whom a petition is lying upon the Table of this House setting forth that he was illegally condemned under an indemnity Act wider in scope than has ever been assented to by the Sovereign, and which is alleged to have been unjustly put into operation; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) It was necessary to deport these prisoners under the Colonial Prisoners Removal Act, and they therefore remain in the *status* of convicts; but it has always been the view of the Secretary of State that the fact of their deportation would justify their receiving while in St. Helena liberal treatment in regard to conditions of their imprisonment, especially in the matter of dietary. He will at once call for a Report from the Governor of St. Helena on this subject, and will authorise him to make such modifications in the scale of dietary and general conditions as are possible consistently with the provisions of the law.

Colonial Audits.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury what is the estimated cost of the projected visit of the Assistant Comptroller and Auditor to the Colonial audit stations of the Mediterranean and of the East and South Coast of Africa; whether, having regard to the fact that provision for such estimated expenditure has been made by the curtailment of various programmes of local audit in the United Kingdom, it is within the competence of the heads of the Exchequer and Audit Department thus to arrange a Colonial inspection by an official to the detriment of the Imperial duties of experienced officers; whether the proposed visit has been undertaken at the instance of the Colonial Office, and, if so, why it was not planned without prejudice to Imperial audits; and whether, in view of the circumstance that during a similar tour by a late Comptroller and Auditor-General it was found desirable to visit the Holy Land and other places of non-financial interest, he can state what control is exercised by the Lords of the Treasury over official journeys of heads of departments to ensure that these shall not be extemporised to furnish opportunities of foreign travel at the public expense.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The visit is undertaken in the public interest with the approval of the Treasury and the Colonial Office, and will not have the consequences suggested. I understand the facts as to a tour by a former Comptroller and Auditor-General are misrepresented in the Question.

Government Pensioners.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether naval, military, or civil pensioners who have commuted their pensions can revert to the position of actual pensioners; and, if so, under what circumstances.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) No, Sir. When a pension has once been commuted it cannot, under any circumstances, be resumed.

Infantile Mortality.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether infant mortality among the poorer classes usually rises greatly in the latter part of the summer and early autumn; whether the mortality would be reduced if parents who are unable to pay for a doctor for their children would apply for medical relief at an early stage of the children's illness; and whether he would advise the guardians to give all facilities to such parents to obtain medical relief for the children, and not to make it a debt or offer it on condition that the parent comes into the workhouse.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I am aware that there is usually an increase in infant mortality in the latter part of the summer and early autumn, especially in hot seasons, and it may be accepted, I think, that competent medical advice and treatment at an early stage of the illness would tend to reduce the mortality. I have, however, no reason to suppose that guardians are unwilling to afford medical relief for children whose parents are unable to provide it, or that persons properly entitled to receive medical relief are deterred from applying for it by the considerations referred to in the last part of the Question. If my hon. friend is aware of any cases of failure to give relief to the infants of parents unable to provide it, and will inform me of the particulars of such cases, I will consider them.

Metropolitan Guardians' Account Audits.

MR. STUART SAMUEL (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the practice of the Metropolitan District Auditor of Poor Law Accounts in issuing a restricted and inadequate notice of his audit of guardians' accounts; and whether he will consider the desirability of issuing instructions for ample and convenient notice of such audit being given locally, as is the case with the audit of the accounts of metropolitan borough councils.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I do not find that I have received any complaints as to the practice of the auditor in this matter. The statutes and orders relating to this subject require that the auditor shall give notice by advertisement, in some newspaper circulating in the county, a reasonable time prior to the audit, and further that he shall give to the clerk to the guardians fourteen days' notice in writing of the time and place at which he intends to commence the audit. The auditor states that the notice given by him has in all cases been such as is required by statute, and that special care has been exercised in seeing that adequate notice has been given. I may add that the clerk to the guardians is required, on hearing from the auditor, to cause a notice in a prescribed form to be affixed to the gate of the workhouse and other places where union notices are usually affixed. The notice refers to the deposit of certain books of accounts for inspection by the owners and ratepayers, the holding of the audit, and the power of any owner or ratepayer who may have any objection to the accounts to attend and be heard by the auditor.

Belfast Telegraph Clerks.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that, in September, 1906, a memorial was submitted to the telegraph superintendent at Belfast by the local secretary of the Postal Telegraph Clerks Association, asking that a staff of male clerks might be sent to the telegraph counter at the head office; and, seeing that in March the men were informed that the change would be made as soon as the duties could be arranged, whether he can state the reason for the absence of effort to carry the promise into effect.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I will have inquiry made and will communicate the result to the hon. Member.

Boy Telegraph Messengers.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the boy telegraph messengers employed at the larger offices complain of their excessive hours of duty on Sunday, for which they practically receive no remuneration; and, if so, will he cause an intimation to be published in the Post Office Official Circular instructing postmasters that the boy messengers are only to be employed on Sunday from 8 a.m. until 8 p.m., all Sunday duty previous to 8 a.m. and after 8 p.m. to be performed by adult night messengers.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that there is a hardship at present imposed upon the adult night messengers of making a special day attendance to receive their weekly wages; and, if so, will he insert instructions in the Post Office Official Circular to the effect that at all offices where adult night messengers are employed they be either paid their wages when leaving off duty on Saturday morning, or be allowed the usual rate of overtime if compelled to put in a special day attendance for the specific purpose of receiving their weekly wages

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I will have inquiry made on the subject of the hon. Member's Questions, and will inform him of the result.

Sub-postmaster's Letter Boxes.

MR. W. T. WILSON (Lancashire, Westhoughton): To ask the Postmaster-General whether sub-postmasters now have letter boxes supplied and fixed free of cost; and, if so, at what date did this departmental concession come into operation.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) It is still the duty of sub-postmasters to provide and fix their own letter boxes. The question of altering the rule has been under consideration, but as the matter was brought before the Select Committee on Post Office Servants my decision has been deferred until the Committee has reported.

Telegraph Vacancies at Derby.

MR. BELL (Derby): To ask the Postmaster-General whether in view of the fact that two vacancies now exist in the telegraph department at Derby, he will direct that two of the telegraphists now performing sorting duties may be reinstated.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I will make inquiry in the matter, and will communicate with the hon. Member.

American Gooseberry Mildew.

MR. BECK (Cambridgeshire, Wisbech): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether, in view of the fact that outbreaks of the American gooseberry-mildew in its highly infectious summer stage have occurred within the last few days in Worcestershire, Gloucestershire, and Norfolk, and that this disease, which has rendered the culture of gooseberries unprofitable and practically impossible wherever it has appeared, spreads with great rapidity by the spores produced in this stage, the Board will place the outbreaks under the charge of one or more properly qualified mycologists to supervise the carrying out of those measures necessary to secure the eradication of the disease.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The Destructive Insects and Pests Act imposes on the local authorities the duty of taking the necessary measures for preventing the spread of the disease; but the Board have been authorised to appoint two inspectors, who will supervise the administration of the Act and give any assistance in their power to the local authorities in the discharge of theirduties.

Royal Courts of Justice.

MR. HERBERT (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe): To ask the First Commissioner of Works whether, having regard to the fact that at present there is at the Royal Courts of Justice one Court too few for the existing number of Judges, and that it is proposed to appoint an additional Judge, he intends to provide Courts and rooms for two Judges; and whether, at any rate, he will, during the coming Long Vacation, proceed with the construction of the Court between Chancery Court 2 and the Lord Chancellor's Court, for which plans have long been in existence.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) No provision has been made in the Estimates for the current year, and it will not, therefore, be possible to make new Courts or rooms until 1908–9, or to undertake any building such as is mentioned in the last paragraph of the Question.

Bombay-Sind Railway.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he has yet received from the Government of India the memorial of the Cutchi inhabitants of Bombay relative to the proposed Bombay-Sind connection railway.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I have requested the Government of India to forward the memorial, but I have not yet received it.

India Public Works Department.

SIR SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether any information exists at the India Office with reference to a scheme of reorganisation for the Public Works Department in India, which was reported to be under consideration by the Government of India two or three years ago; and whether any scheme for improving the pay and prospects of the Department has as yet been before the Secretary of State.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) An increase of pay in the administrative grades of the engineering branch of the Public Works Department was sanctioned by my predecessor in August, 1905. I am not aware of any other scheme under consideration for improving the pay and prospects of the Department.

Royal Irish Constabulary at Newry.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that only one sergeant out of thirty-two sergeants and men of the Royal Irish Constabulary stationed at Newry is a Protestant; whether such arrangement is by design or accident; and if he proposes to make any change.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Inspector-General informs me that the force stationed at Newry consists of thirty-two sergeants and constables. Of this number one sergeant and eight constables are Protestants, and an existing vacancy is to be filled by the allocation of a second Protestant sergeant. The assignment of policemen to stations is a matter for the Inspector-General, and I do not propose to interfere with his discretion.

Irish Tenants as Caretakers.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what was the number of tenants converted into caretakers by service of ejectment notices under Section 7 of the Land Law Act of 1887 in each of the years 1901 to 1906, inclusive; what was the number of actual evictions for non-payment of rent throughout Ireland in each such year, and the number of farms retaken by former tenants and the number of farms retaken by new tenants in each such year, distinguishing in the case of the latter the number who came to an arrangement with the evicted tenants before they entered in possession.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*)

Year.	(1.) Number of tenants converted into caretakers by service of ejectment notice under Section 7 of the Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1887, in Ireland.	(2.) Number of actual evictions of tenants from agricultural holdings at the suit of landlords.
1901 - -	2,482	226
1902 - -	2,694	193
1903 - -	2,257	231
1904 - -	2,414	169
1905 - -	2,221	134
1906 - -	2,191	164

This information has been extracted from Returns presented to Parliament. As regards (2) it is not possible to distinguish cases in which evictions were for non-payment of rent, but it may be assumed that the great majority were of that nature. Returns have been given from time to time containing the information asked for in the remainder of the Question, so far as regards evicted farms on the estates commonly known as Plan of Campaign estates, and I informed the hon. Member for Mid. Armagh on the 16th instant that I would offer no objection to the granting of a Return in continuation of the last such Return (Parliamentary Paper No. 173, of Session 1903). I find that similar Returns as regards evicted farms generally have not heretofore been presented to Parliament, and I do not propose to make any new departure in this respect.

Sir Robert Hudson's Cavan Tenantry.

MR. SAMUEL YOUNG (Cavan, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the tenants on Sir Robert Hudson's estate, county Cavan, have signed agreements for the purchase of their holdings, and that a number of tenants who had turbary rights also signed agreements surrendering these rights in consideration of receiving a further reduction in their instalments; whether he is aware that the landlord now proposes to give all the good turbary to those tenants who have surrendered their rights and nothing but after-bog to the others, who are unwilling under the conditions to purchase; and whether, in view of these facts, the Estates Commissioners are prepared to advance money for the purchase of the estate.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that since notice of this Question was given they have learnt that a satisfactory agreement as regards turbary has been arrived at between the vendor and the purchasing tenants.

Holyrood Urban District Council.

MR. J. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the urban district council of Holywood has discovered that its late clerk, James H. Barrett, received, between the 6th December, 1900, and the 29th January, 1905, various fees in respect of transfers of grave lots; that the said James Hunter Barrett failed to account for said sums; whether he will state the circumstances under which the discovery was made, and the nature of the entries made by James Hunter Barrett in respect of the said sums respectively; whether the council have taken any, and if so, what steps in regard to said embezzlements; does the council intend to prosecute in respect of these and other serious embezzlements by James H. Barrett; and if not, will the Government institute an independent inquiry.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Local Government Board have ascertained that the urban district council are at present considering what steps should be taken in regard to the circumstances alleged in the Question. Having regard to the possible outcome of the case, it is not at present desirable to make any statement as to the facts or to consider the question of an inquiry.

Army Meat Tenders.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the War Office, when recently calling for tenders for preserved beef, selected a time for the delivery of tenders which rendered it impossible for Australian firms to compete; has the War Office, in reply to representations made on behalf of the Australian canners, declined to alter the date fixed; whether Australian preserved meats have ever been viewed with suspicion; whether the method of inspection of Australian preserved meat has been favourably reported on by the officer sent out by the War Office to visit the canning works; and will he direct that in future the time selected for tenders shall not be such as must necessarily give the contracts to American firms and preclude Australia from competing.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The War Office have to issue tenders for preserved meat according to their requirements at the time. In the case under comment the date for delivery of the tenders could not have been altered without seriously interfering with the turnover of the stocks held as reserves. Australian preserved meat is not viewed with suspicion. The officer sent to visit the

Australian canning works has not returned to this country, and no Report has been received from him. The time selected for issue of tenders must be governed by War Department requirements, but every endeavour will be made to meet the convenience of the Australian market as far as it is possible to do so.

Afforestry in the Forest of Dean.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs): To ask the Prime Minister whether an expert forest officer will be appointed to fill the vacancy at the Forest of Dean; and whether any progress has been made with respect to the purchase by the Woods and Forests Commissioners of land in Argyll for afforestation purposes.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) The interests of forestry will not be lost sight of in the re-arrangements which are under consideration. The purchase referred to in the latter part of the Question is still under consideration.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Portsmouth Dockyard Discharges.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL (Staffordshire, Kingswinford): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty how many men have been discharged from the dockyard at Portsmouth since January, 1906, who have had more than twenty years service.

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. LAMBERT, Devonshire, South Molton): 188 men with more than twenty years' service have left Portsmouth Dockyard since January, 1906, but none of these were discharged on reduction.

Dockyard Discharges.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty how many men have been discharged from the dockyards at Pembroke, Devonport, Portsmouth, and Chatham since January, 1906; and in how many cases were men discharged with more than ten years' service.

MR. LAMBERT: The number of men who have been discharged from the dockyards named between 1st January, 1906, and the 6th July, 1907, is as follows:—On reduction, 439; other causes, 2,798. During the same period 3,538 men have been entered. Of the 439 men discharged on reduction, 434 were discharged prior to the 30th June, 1906, and only five subsequently. 308 of the men who were discharged on reduction, and 484 of those who left from other causes, had over ten years' service.

Naval and Marine Pensions.

*MR. KELLEY (Manchester, S.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that, by printed regulations issued prior to 1878, all men joining the Navy and Marines were promised that, subject to good character, the ordinary pensions of their rating which they might earn would receive an augmentation of 5d. per day at the age of 55, and a further augmentation subsequently; that men, having reached the age of 55, have had their applications for fulfilment of this undertaking refused on the grounds that the Admiralty have no funds at their disposal for this purpose; and what steps the Admiralty propose to take to remedy the alleged grievance.

MR. LAMBERT: The whole of the funds annually available for the pensions referred to in the Question is expended upon them. If my hon. friend requires further information as to these pensions, may I refer him to Command Paper 138 of Session 1892?

Submarines.

MR. GEORGE FABER (York): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty why seven submarines have been ordered from Messrs. Vickers since the present Government came into office, and none of any other firm; and whether any firm, excepting that of Messrs. Vickers, has been invited to tender for submarines; and, if not, why not.

MR. LAMBERT: Messrs. Vickers were the firm who first took up submarine boat construction in this country, and they have gained much experience with these vessels. It is not known that any submarine boat suitable for His Majesty's service has been constructed in the country by any other firm; but if any shipbuilding firm should submit a design of a submarine vessel, such design would receive the full consideration of the Admiralty.

MR. GEORGE FABER: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty why the sanction of the Treasury was not first received before submarines were ordered from Messrs. Vickers without competitive tenders having been obtained or other firms invited to compete.

MR. LAMBERT: The hon. Member has already been informed by my right hon. friend the Secretary to the Admiralty, in reply to a previous Question on Monday last, that Treasury sanction was not required.

MR. GEORGE FABER: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that the finding of the Public Accounts Committee was to a contrary effect?

MR. LAMBERT: Not on this subject.

MR. GEORGE FABER: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what the approximate difference in cost is likely to be between the submarines commenced in the Government dockyards at Chatham and those ordered from Messrs. Vickers.

MR. LAMBERT: The work on the boats building at Chatham is not sufficiently far advanced to enable a reliable estimate to be given.

The Channel Fleet.

MR. GEORGE FABER: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what was the last date when the Channel Fleet had its full complement of fourteen battleships assembled; and how many of the fourteen battleships are absent now.

MR. LAMBERT: The fourteen battleships of the Channel Fleet have not been assembled since the battle squadron was reconstituted in March last. Two battleships are now absent, viz., the "Triumph," which is in dockyard hands at Chatham, and the "New Zealand," which is preparing to proceed from Devonport to Bantry for gun trials.

MR. GEORGE FABER: May I ask why the hon. Gentleman informed me in this House on 24th June that all the battleships were assembled?

MR. LAMBERT: I did not intend to convey that.

Smokeless Blank Cartridge.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if the military authorities at Aldershot desire smokeless blank cartridge for Artillery for use in training officers and men; and, if so, if he will supply this want.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): The desirability of a smokeless blank ammunition for Artillery is admitted; but although several designs have been tried, no satisfactory explosive at a reasonable cost has been found. Experiments are, however, being continued.

Military Officers in the House of Commons.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether officers in the Army on the active list are not allowed to be candidates, while occupying this position, for Parliamentary constituencies, and are compelled by a War Office regulation, or the practice of the War Office, to retire from the House of Commons on appointment to military commands; whether Peers of the Realm on the active list, and as such executive servants of the public, are entitled by the practice of the War Office to combine military and Parliamentary duties, while Members of this House are disqualified, by the practice of the War Office, from retaining their seats when placed on the active list; whether he will explain the reason of the difference made in favour of Army officers who are Members of the House of Lords to the disadvantage of Army officers who are Members of the House of Commons; and whether he intends to take any, and, if so, what steps to rectify this class distinction.

MR. HALDANE: There is no regulation against an officer becoming a candidate for a seat in the House of Commons, nor is it the practice of the War Office to intervene in this matter. If, however, he is elected, he remains on the active list but is placed uponhalf-pay.

An officer is required to vacate his seat on being appointed to a command, because it is considered that the work of a Member of this House would engross too much of an officer's time, and that consequently the interests, comforts and efficiency of the troops placed under his command would thereby suffer. These rules are not applicable to Members of the House of Lords, as they cannot divest themselves of their duties as such. Hence an officer who is a Member of the House of Commons occupies a somewhat more favourable position under these rules than one who is a Member of the House of Lords, in that while being retained on the active list he is relieved from the performance of all military duty and is thus enabled to devote his whole time and energy to his legislative duties.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL said that that was very delightful for military men. He asked whether the Government were seriously considering the rectification of such a state of things, whereby a military man in command was excluded from the House, while a military man who was a Member of the other House had full right of discussion there, and possibly could move a vote of censure on the Ministry and then proceed to take his pay from the War Office.

MR. HALDANE: We have not been troubled with the evil my hon. friend refers to.

Treatment at Zulu Prisoners at St. Helena.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Minute of the acting Prime Minister of Natal, sent to the Governor, and printed on page 13 of Cd. 3563, in which it is inferred or stated specifically that the Zulu prisoners in St. Helena will be under the supervision of a staff of warders armed with rifles, that they will be confined in rooms with iron bars fixed on the windows, three or four men being in one room, and that they are to receive no groceries except salt, is accepted by His Majesty's Government as being equal to the standard which they had in mind when they consented to the removal of these men from Natal; whether in view of the different conditions of life, climatic and otherwise, between St. Helena and Natal, His Majesty's Government consider that the dietary scale set out on page 11 of this paper, showing that the food is to consist almost exclusively of mealie meal, is satisfactory; and whether His Majesty's Government propose to make any representations to the Natal authorities for a revision of the scale and for the addition of groceries other than salt.

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): I beg also to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Colonies whether the twenty-five Zulu prisoners recently deported from Natal to St. Helena are regarded as political prisoners; what are the conditions of their captivity; what are their rations; to what privations, other than the loss of freedom, are they subjected; are those who are chiefs accorded treatment commensurate with their superior rank of life; and how far does the Home Government regard itself responsible that they shall be treated in accordance with the traditions that prevail in this country.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD: I beg further to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that on arrival at St. Helena the Zulu prisoners were in an emaciated condition and looked half-starved, and some of them were hardly able to walk; whether amongst these is the chief Tilonko, from whom a petition is lying upon the Table of this House setting forth that he was illegally condemned under an indemnity Act wider in scope than has ever been assented to by the Sovereign, and which is alleged to have been unjustly put into operation; and whether he proposes to take any action on the matter.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): It was necessary to deport these prisoners under the Colonial Prisoners Removal Act, and they therefore remain in the *status* of convicts, but it has always been the view of the Secretary of State that the fact of their deportation would justify their receiving, while in St. Helena, liberal treatment in regard to conditions of their imprisonment, especially in the matter of dietary. He will at once call for a Report from the Governor of St. Helena on this subject, and will authorise him to make such modifications in the scale of dietary and general conditions as are possible consistently with the provisions of the law.

Fighting in the New Hebrides.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has any official news of the fighting in the New Hebrides; and whether he will furnish any details.

MR. CHURCHILL: I have to refer the hon. and gallant Member to the Answer which I gave yesterday to the hon. Member for the North-Western Division of Lancashire.

Imports of Arms and Spirits into the New Hebrides.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has any official information showing that vessels chartered under the French flag have recently left Sydney carrying arms, ammunition, and spirits for importation into the New Hebrides.

MR. CHURCHILL: No, Sir; but I will inquire.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Can the right hon. Gentleman give the result of the inquiries he promised to make two months ago?

MR. CHURCHILL was understood to say he had not yet received the reply.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) asked if British subjects were not placed at a great disadvantage by the delay in the issue of the Proclamation, as they were prohibited carrying arms, ammunition, and spirits.

MR. CHURCHILL asked for notice.

Concessions in China.

MR. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has discussed with Sir Ernest Satow the question of concessions in China; whether any settlement has been arrived at with the Chinese Government; and, if so, can he state the nature of it to the House.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): The Answer to the first part of the hon. Member's Question is in the affirmative, but we have so far arrived at no general settlement with the Chinese Government regarding concessions in China. Negotiations are proceeding separately with a view to the settlement of each outstanding case.

Egyptian Postage.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, seeing that the total correspondence passing through the Egyptian Post Office in 1906 increased to 58,000,000 as against 50,770,000 in 1905, and that since the introduction of the penny postage the correspondence exchanged between Egypt and the United Kingdom and British Colonies has increased by 60 per cent., he will now endeavour to induce the Egyptian Government to place Egypt on an equal footing as to postal rates with the United Kingdom and the Colonies.

SIR EDWARD GREY: As the penny postage already exists I do not understand to what difference the hon. Member's Question refers.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: Is it not the case that the postage is about 1¼d.?

SIR EDWARD GREY: Yes, it is the case there is a slight difference due to the rate of the exchange.

Galapagos Islands.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can make any statement with regard to the British subjects kept in a state of servitude in the Galapagos Islands.

SIR EDWARD GREY: It has been found impracticable for His Majesty's Consul at Guayaquil to go in person to the Galapagos Islands, owing to the considerable time necessary for the journey He has been instructed, therefore, to send a trustworthy agent to the islands, with power to bring away all those who wish to leave. Some time must elapse, however, before the result of his mission is known, as no ship leaves for the islands till the beginning of August and the journey there and back takes about five weeks.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Have the instructions been sent by cable?

SIR EDWARD GREY: Yes, Sir.

Egyptian Educational Service.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the increase recorded by Lord Cromer of over 100 per cent. in the European *personnel* in the Egyptian secondary schools and higher colleges in the years 1896–1906, and the decrease of 25 per cent. in the Egyptian *personnel* in the same department in the same period, are due to a falling-off in the number of Egyptians educated for such posts; and, if so, whether he can explain how such a falling-off in the educational provision made under the supervision of the Minister of Education by the British Adviser has taken place.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The demand for secondary and higher education, and the development of it, has been increasing more rapidly than the supply of Egyptian teachers; measures are in hand to remedy the deficiency as far as it is possible.

Newfoundland Fisheries.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether it is intended to submit the questions in dispute in reference to the Newfoundland fisheries to arbitration; and what arrangements are to be made to cover the forthcoming fishing season.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I am unable to give any information at the present stage of the negotiations, but I hope to be able to make a general statement on the subject before the end of the session. It is now under discussion between the Governments concerned.

SIR GILBERT PARKER asked as to the bearing of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty on these negotiations.

SIR EDWARD GREY said it was difficult to establish any analogy between the two cases.

Assault on a British Telegraphist at Odessa.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has received any information with regard to the assault on Mr. T. Hutchinson, a member of the staff of the Indo-European Telegraphs, who was beaten on the head in the Deribasovskaya, one of the busiest thoroughfares in Odessa; and, seeing that Mr. Hutchinson obtained no satisfaction from the local police, what action he proposes to take in the matter.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have not yet received any report respecting this incident from His Majesty's Consul General at Odessa, and am therefore at present unable to reply to the second part of the hon. Member's Question, but I will make inquiries.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Will they be made by cable?

SIR EDWARD GREY: No; by despatch.

San Thomé and Principé.

MR. ARKWRIGHT (Hereford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is yet in a position to lay Papers before the House with regard to the conditions of labour in the islands of San Thomé and Principé.

SIR EDWARD GREY: There are no Papers on the subject referred to by the hon. Member for Hereford which could be usefully laid before the House. I would refer the hon. Member to the reply given to the hon. Member for Orkney and Shetland and circulated with the Votes on Friday last.†

Income-Tax.

MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether in the case of persons now entitled to a remission of income-tax on earned incomes, but who have already filled up for this year a return to the Income-Tax Commissioners, a supplemental application form for the lower rate will be supplied, or, if not, whether collectors of income-tax will be instructed to give any and what facilities to such taxpayers to make a demand for the lower rate.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxviii., 196.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Asquith, Fife, E.): It is proposed to supply supplemental forms to persons who have already made returns for the current year, and who may appear to be entitled to relief in respect of earned income. If anyone so entitled should not receive such supplemental form within the next month, he should apply to the surveyor of his district, who will see that the omission is repaired.

Savings Banks Balance Sheets.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state why, as the Savings Banks Act of 1904 gave effect to the recommendation of the Select Committee of 1902 that publication of the balance sheets of the savings banks should be discontinued, effect has not been given to the recommendation of the same Committee that the rate of interest to depositors should be reduced, with the object of relieving the general taxpayer from the burden of making good the annual loss in the income accounts of the savings banks.

Mr. ASQUITH: Before the late Chancellor of the Exchequer brought in his Bill for giving effect to the recommendations of the Select Committee, the question of reducing the rates of interest was discussed in Committee of Supply, on the 15th March, 1904.† The right hon. Gentleman then expressed his concurrence in the Committee's view that Parliament should not be called upon permanently to vote money for the purpose of paying to savings bank depositors a higher rate of interest than could be earned on the investments. But he pointed out that financial conditions had changed since the date of the Committee's inquiry so as to justify the hope that, without any reduction of the rate of interest payable, the annual deficiency might be reduced and possibly be extinguished. I understand that his decision not to alter the rate of interest was generally approved. Owing partly to the increased earning power on new investments and partly to certain changes effected by the Act of 1904, the total deficiency on the income of the two savings banks funds, which in 1903 was £183,690, had been reduced in 1906 to £129,361. And the reduction would have been greater, but for the inclusion last year of a special non-recurrent charge of about £24,000. I see no reason at present for departing from the policy of the last Government.

Trustee Savings Banks.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that, in the year 1880, there was a deficiency estimated by Mr. Gladstone at £3,565,000 in the Trustee Savings Banks, the amount being arrived at by valuation of the securities held; that the deficiency was provided for by the creation of a terminable annuity to run for twenty-eight years, the term being afterwards extended to 1917; that the cost of making good this deficiency has been borne, and is now being borne by the taxpayers in general; and that the same method of valuation would reveal a new deficiency, quite apart from the old, in the Trustee Savings Banks, and a deficiency of over £10,000,000 in the Post Office Savings Bank; and whether, regard being had to the circumstances, he will consider the expediency of making provision for reducing and finally extinguishing these deficiencies (if they exist) by setting up terminable annuities, as was done in 1880 in the case of the Trustee Savings Banks.

Mr. ASQUITH: I am aware that the Trustee Savings Banks deficiency annuity was created in 1881 to make good an estimated depletion of the assets of the Trustee Savings Banks Fund, which had been caused primarily by the practice, pursued in earlier years, of paying interest out of capital. The fund has not been allowed to incur any further deficiency from that cause, as since 1876 every deficit on the annual income account has been made good by the Votes of Parliament; nor has a similar deficiency ever been incurred by the Post Office Savings Banks Fund. I am not prepared to ask Parliament to take the same steps for making good any deficiency which might appear upon an arbitrary valuation of the securities as were considered necessary when there had been a real inroad upon the assets of the fund.

---

† See (4) *Debates,* cxxxi., 1153 *et seq.*

Police Persecution of Ex-Convicts.

MR. THORNE (West Ham, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to a statement made by William Page to the stipendiary at the West Ham Police Court, on Tuesday, 25th June, when he was sentenced to three months for stealing a roll of oilcloth, that he had been going straight until a constable informed his employer that he was an ex-convict, the result being that he was dismissed from his work, which caused him to steal the oilcloth; and whether it is the duty of police constables to inform employers as to whether any of their employees have been sent to prison.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I am making inquiries into this case. I shall be glad if the hon. Member can furnish me with the name or number of the officer concerned, or the name of the employer, and then perhaps he will put down a further Question.

Factory Inspection.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been drawn to Table 8 in the Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories for 1906, wherein it is shown that the number of names of outworkers received are greatly in excess of the number of visits made by the medical officers of health in Sheffield, Belfast, Worcester, Ipswich, Gloucestershire, West Ham, Westminster and other areas; and what steps he proposes to take to make this inspection efficient.

MR. GLADSTONE: Yes, Sir. This table was included in the Chief Inspector's Report by my directions, with a view to the improvement of the present conditions. The steps that have been taken by me to improve the administration of the Home Work provisions of the Factory Act by the local authorities have been to issue a circular on the subject to the authorities and the medical officers calling their attention to the importance of a thorough administration of the Act, and secondly to propose that the matter shall be discussed at a conference with medical officers of health which it is intended to hold at the Home Office in the autumn.

Medical Officers of Health and Factory Inspection.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been drawn to the fact, as shown in the Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories for 1906, that 634 medical officers of health still neglect to perform the statutory duties imposed on them by the Factory and Workshop Act to report to the Home Office regarding their administration of that Act; and how long the Home Office proposes to allow this neglect to continue.

MR. GLADSTONE: The great majority of the medical officers who have failed to send in reports, viz.: 477 out of 634, are in Ireland. Under the Irish Public Health Law, medical officers, other than the few superintending medical officers, are not required to make any report to the local authority, and I am advised that it is doubtful how far in consequence any obligation is placed upon them by Section 132 of the Factory Act. As I have already stated, a special circular was sent out last year by the Home Office calling the attention of local authorities and medical officers to their duties in regard to home work—and I propose to communicate specially this autumn with those local authorities from whom no reports are received for 1906. I may add that in many districts from which no report is sent, the Factory Act has little or no application and the omission is comparatively unimportant.

Inspections of Outworkers.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been drawn to the figures in the Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories, showing that in 1905, in the borough of Stepney, the medical officer reports only thirty-two inspections of outworkers out of 8,998 persons notified to be such in the two half-yearly Returns, and that the same medical officer reported no inspection in 1904; and why, in view of these facts, he has not authorised an independent inspection at the expense of this borough under Section 4 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901.

MR. GLADSTONE: I am aware of the figures referred to and am communicating with the borough council on the subject. I am advised that it is doubtful whether the powers under Section 4 of the Factory Act cover a case such as this. But, in any event, for the Factory Department to assume in this and similar cases the duties in respect to home work which the Act imposes on local authorities would be to add greatly to the work of a Department already more than fully employed. The whole question of home work is now under the consideration of a Select Committee of this House, and pending their Report I cannot see my way to make the considerable change in the administration of these provisions which is suggested by the hon. Member.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD: Was not Section 4 specially drafted to meet such cases ?

MR. GLADSTONE: I imagine that is so; but there are difficulties arising out of dual administration.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the fact, as shown in Table 8 of an Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories for 1906, that in 2,194 cases, on the showing of medical officers of health, employers were discovered to have sent in to the district council no list of outworkers as provided by Section 107 of the Act, and that of these no fewer than 753 remained unremedied, a substantial increase being thus shown in the neglect in this respect over last year; whether his attention has also been drawn to the increased number of defects remaining unremedied as regards work being given out to be done in unwholesome premises, and allowing wearing apparel to be made in premises infected by scarlet fever or small-pox; and whether he can inform the House what steps the Home Office is taking to reduce the number of these cases of negligence on the part of so many medical officers of health.

MR. GLADSTONE: I am aware of the figures to which the hon. Member calls attention. Taking all the figures which relate to outworkers' lists together, the Returns for 1905 seem to me to point to an appreciable increase of activity on the part of the local authorities in regard to the collection of these lists. 2,500 more lists were received, and 18,000 more names of outworkers, and the fact that nearly 700 more failures were discovered than last year, shows, I think, that the officers of the local authority are following up these cases more carefully than before, and perhaps also compiling the Returns for the Home Office more carefully. I may call the attention of the hon. Member to the fact that the number of prosecutions taken by local authorities for failure to send in the lists is more than double that of 1904. As regards action under Sections 108 to 110, I do not think any trustworthy inferences can be drawn from the figures referred to in the Question, for the reasons mentioned in the introduction to last year's Return. I have already stated, in Answer to a previous Question, the action taken by me with a view to improving the administration of the home work provisions of the Act by the local authorities.

Sunderland Hair Dressers' Closing Order.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to an application made to the Corporation of Sunderland by the local hairdressers' association for a closing order, under The Shop Hours Act, 1904, the petition for the same having been signed by 104 of those interested out of a possible 118, and the subsequent ballot vote revealing sixty-seven for and twenty-five against, but, by adding twenty-nine who had not voted, the corporation refused to put in force the Act, as the two-thirds required had not been obtained; and, if so, whether he can make any promise as to introducing legislation having for its object the remedying of the defect indicated, namely, the adding of all those who do not vote to the minority.

MR. GLADSTONE: I know nothing of this case except what is contained in the newspaper extracts with which my hon. friend has been good enough to supply me. I do not gather from them that the non-voters were added to the minority, nor is there any requirement in the law that they should be so added. What is required is that the town council should be satisfied that the occupiers of two-thirds of all the shops to be affected approve the order. This two-thirds majority is not shown *prima facie* as the result of the voting in the case in question. Whether the town council could take any further steps to satisfy themselves in the matter I am not in possession of sufficient information to judge.

Aged Workmen and the Workmen's Compensation Act.

MR. SUMMERBELL: I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he is aware that in Sunderland and district large numbers of old men are being paid off, due to the coming into operation of the Compensation Act; and, if so, can he state whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce any legislation having for its object the mitigation of the hardship and suffering likely to ensue on account of such dismissals.

MR. GLADSTONE: I beg to answer this Question on behalf of my right hon. friend. I have no information other than that furnished by the hon. Member as to what has taken place at Sunderland. But I may remind him that on Report stage of the Workmen's Compensation Bill, I proposed the insertion of a clause which would have gone far to safeguard old men against the risk of losing their employment, and I pressed for its adoption on the ground that the Departmental Committee, whose views I shared, considered that without such a safeguard there was real danger of old and infirm workmen being prejudicially affected by the new act. That clause was left to the free decision of the House in pursuance of a promise given in Committee, and it was, unfortunately, in my opinion, rejected by 211 votes to 133. I think the hon. Member voted in the majority against it.

Brighton Unemployed Funds.

MR. THORNE: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that some of the funds placed by him at the disposal of the Brighton Distress Committee are being used by them to provide cheap labour for a weaving firm in Haworth, Yorkshire; and whether he intends taking any action in the matter.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): I understand that the Distress Committee, in exercise of powers conferred upon them by the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905, have assisted the removal of two families to Haworth, for the purpose of enabling them to take advantage of an opportunity of obtaining permanent and remunerative employment in certain mills in that town. The whole of the cost of the removal has, however, been borne by the rate contribution account, and no part of it has been defrayed in the manner stated in the Question. The entire amount paid to the Committee out of the Parliamentary Grant has been expended in the provision of temporary work in Brighton.

Remission of Surcharges.

MR. E. GARDNER (Berkshire, Wokingham): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the Local Government Board are prepared either directly or indirectly through their powers of remission of surcharges, to sanction a local authority becoming its own insurer under The Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906, by such authority instituting a fund and paying into it each year a sum of money to be applied to the payment of claims under this Act, instead of such authority insuring with an insurance company.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I am advised that under ordinary circumstances a local authority would not be empowered to form such a fund as that suggested. It would not be in accordance with the practice of the Local Government Board to sanction recurring illegal expenditure, either directly or by the remission of surcharges, nor do I think that they could properly do so.

Croydon Vaccination Case.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if his attention has been called to the case of a boy who died in Croydon on the 29th April last as the result of vaccination; if he is aware that the case was investigated by

Dr. Copeman, of the Local Government Board; that the child had sores on the head, face and arms, and lingered in agony for three months; will he say if he is still supplying public vaccinators with the same class of lymph; and if he will lay Dr. Copeman's Report upon the Table.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I am aware of the case referred to, though I do not know that the child lingered in agony for three months, nor had I been informed of his death. The case was investigated by Dr. Copeman and several medical men. Twenty other cases were vaccinated with the same lymph as this child, and, so far as was ascertained, the case in question was the only one in which the child subsequently had sores. These sores appear to have been, in fact, "bromide rash," and to have been due, not to vaccination, but to doses of bromide of potassium administered by the mother on account of the fits from which the child suffered. It is estimated that 178 grains of the drug were given to him. Dr. Copeman's Report is a confidential document, and I could not undertake to lay it on the Table.

MR. LUPTON: Does the right hon. Gentleman consider a death rate of 5 per cent. in vaccination cases trifling.

MR. JOHN BURNS: The percentage was not asked for. I must have notice.

MR. LUPTON: The right hon. Gentleman has spoken of one in twenty as if it were a trifling matter.

Secondary Education Code.

MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if he can now state when the new Code and the new Regulations dealing with secondary schools will be circulated among Members.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. LOUGH, Islington, W.): The Secondary School Regulations were circulated on the 2nd July and the Code on the 5th July.

Clerks to Surveyors of Taxes.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if a Departmental Committee has been appointed to inquire into the alleged grievances of the clerks to surveyors of taxes; if not, whether it is intended to appoint such a Committee, or what steps it is proposed to take to investigate the case made by these clerks.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury): No such Committee has been appointed, but the Chancellor of the Exchequer received a deputation from the officers referred to some time ago, and their representations are now under his consideration.

Belfast Trade Dispute.

MR. JOWETT (Bradford, W.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to the prosecutions arising from the trade dispute in Belfast, when local magistrates interested in the dispute have appeared upon the bench and given sentence; whether his attention has been drawn to the case of Edward O'Reilly, charged before a resident magistrate and a local justice with riotous behaviour and fined the maximum penalty of 40s., supplemented, however, by a proviso that he should give bail himself in £4 and find two sureties in £20 each to keep the peace, and in default of finding such bail that he should be imprisoned for three calendar months; whether it is customary that justices, in addition to imposing the maximum penalty provided by statute, should impose a further punishment by having recourse to their powers under their commission; and whether, in view of the whole circumstances of the case, he will take steps to secure a revision of the sentences passed by local justices in connection with cases that have arisen out of the Belfast dispute.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): Before the right hon. Gentleman answers the Question, may I ask if he is aware that one of those sentenced connected with the strike has a record of eighty-three previous convictions, seventeen of which were assaults on the police, and that another had against him eighty-two convictions?

*MR. SPEAKER: I do not see how this arises out of the Question, which refers to one particular individual.

MR. LONSDALE: The Question asks whether the sentences passed by local justices in connection with cases that have arisen out of the Belfast dispute may not be revised.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND, (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange): According to the information I have received, the local magistrates in Belfast have taken very little part in cases connected with the labour dispute. The Belfast police courts are invariably presided over by a resident magistrate, and in no case have local magistrates sitting alone dealt with prosecutions arising out of the strike. I am informed that the facts connected with the case of Edward O'Reilly are as stated in the Question, and that neither of the magistrates who acted in that case has the slightest interest in the labour dispute. I have no power to secure a revision of sentences passed by magistrates, but the Lord-Lieutenant has power to mitigate punishment in such cases, and I have no doubt that any petition presented to His Excellency would receive full consideration. I understand, however, that an appeal has been lodged in the particular case in question, and the matter is therefore *sub judice*.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL asked whether it was not a fact that magistrates who had interest either direct or indirect in the subject matter of the dispute were disqualified from sitting and adjudicating.

*MR. SPEAKER: That point does not arise. The Attorney-General has said that the magistrates had no interest either direct or indirect in the dispute.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL said that remark had escaped his notice.

Nazareth Roman Catholic Industrial School, Belfast.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he has yet taken any steps towards releasing the two Protestant boys, William and Samuel Welsh, from the Nazareth Roman Catholic Industrial School, Belfast, who are detained there against the expressed wish of their father, who is willing and able to maintain them.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The children referred to were committed to the Nazareth Lodge Industrial School on 4th August, 1906. It was proved in evidence that the children's mother had died shortly before, and that the father had left the children with his own mother saying that she could do what she liked with them as he was going to work his passage to Canada. The grandmother was unable to support the children, and they had been subsisting on charity. Certificates of baptism of the children as Roman Catholics were produced and attached to the records of the Court, and it was stated that the father himself was of that religion. I have received from a solicitor an application for the release of the children, but up to the present no evidence has been adduced that the father is now a Protestant or that, in fact, he desires the release of the children. If such evidence should be forthcoming, I will give the case full consideration.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): Will the right hon. Gentleman further inquire into the facts?

MR. BIRRELL: I have learned that the father wanders about without a shirt. From that I draw no inference.

Irish Evicted Tenants.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any communication has been sent to those evicted tenants whose applications for reinstatement have been refused by the Estates Commissioners; and, if so, what is the nature of the communication.

MR. BIRRELL: It is the practice of the Estates Commissioners to inform an evicted tenant that his application has been rejected when such is the fact. The Commissioners do not use any set form of communication in these cases; the nature of the communication depends upon the circumstances of the case.

Ruan Disturbances.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has any information respecting a conflict between the

Irish Constabulary and a party of moonlighters at Ruan, near Ennis, on Sunday night; whether any shots were exchanged; and whether any arrests were made.

Mr. BIRRELL: On Sunday afternoon last between five and six o'clock two policemen were escorting a man who is under police protection when several shots were fired from a wood through which the road passes. The police fired two shots in return, and at once entered the wood in the direction from which the shots appeared to come, but failed to discover the offenders. No one was injured.

Navigation Works (Ireland) Bill.

Mr. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland when it is proposed to proceed with the Navigation Works (Ireland) Bill.

Mr. BIRRELL: This Bill will be proceeded with at the earliest opportunity, but I am not in a position to name a date.

Creation of Peers.

Mr. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): I beg to ask the Prime Minister will His Majesty's Government agree to have printed and distributed the articles of impeachment on which this House impeached the Earl of Oxford in 1715 for recommending the creation of twelve Peers, and also the Reports made from time to time to this House during his consequent two years imprisonment in the Tower.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs): This is an historical inquiry the facts of which can be discovered by any one who has the time to explore the records of the times in which impeachments and executions were freely resorted to. My hon. friend is not quite accurate in saying that the Earl of Oxford was impeached for recommending the creation of Peers. He was impeached on many other counts more serious than this. The creation of Peers was the sixteenth count in the indictment. I presume that my hon. friend does not desire to revive that method of controlling the Government of the country, and I think we had better leave the documents to the historian and the archæologist.

Mr. MARKHAM: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that *The Times* was not published in 1715 and that the Earl of Oxford was impeached on a charge of misdemeanour, which was not proceeded with, and that the sentence of two years imprisonment was for having recommended corruptly and improperly to the other House the making of new Peers?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have not bestowed so much time on the matter as my hon. friend apparently has, but I have examined cursorily the documents, and I do not find that there is any imputation of corrupt creation of Peers. The impeachment turns on at least fifteen other counts as well as this, and it is not, therefore, exactly a case in point.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware of the precedent in which the Duke of Buckingham was impeached for selling a Peerage for £10,000 to a gentleman named Lord Roberts? A most interesting case.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: One archæologist after another comes before me with interesting cases, but I do not think they will affect my estimate of the circumstances of the present day.

Radiotelegraphic Report.

Sir EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he will, in the public interest, afford the House some opportunity of discussing the Report of the Radiotelegraphic Committee, in view of its importance to the defence and commerce of the Empire.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not think I can alter the decision I have announced to the House on this subject.

Sir EDWARD SASSOON asked whether the public interest would not be served by giving the opportunity for discussion.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It is a matter of opinion. The Committee was not appointed on the motion of the Government; it was appointed to please my hon. friend, and he has had his Committee.

MR. FORSTER (Kent, Sevenoaks) asked if it was the intention of the Government to deal with a matter of such grave financial importance without affording the House the opportunity of discussion.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: We proceed upon our own discretion and responsibility in the matter, and we are supported by the Report of the Committee.

MR. GWYNN (Galway) asked if the right hon. Gentleman was aware of the fact that the Committee, with the exception of his own official supporters, demanded a rediscussion, in view of facts made public for the first time.

SIR GILBERT PARKER reminded the Prime Minister of the evidence accumulated, and asked if there was any intention to advise a revision of the Convention.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: We propose to ratify the Convention upon our responsibility and taking our view of the situation.

Sugar Convention.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the variety and complexity of the subjects to be debated on the Foreign Office Vote, a short sitting may be allocated for discussing the recent departure in the policy with regard to the Sugar Convention, announced by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No, Sir, I see no advantage in a discussion at this stage. The proposals of His Majesty's Government respecting the Sugar Convention are known and are being considered by other Governments who are parties to the Convention. Till the result of this consideration is known it is not possible for the Government to make any further statement.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS (Kent, St. Augustine's) asked as to the course of business.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: We propose before taking the Criminal Appeal Bill to-morrow to take stages of the Telegraph (Money) Bill and the Post Office Sites Bill, for these are somewhat urgent. The latter is non-contentious, and the Amendments to the former are agreed upon, so that they will not occupy much time. On Monday the first business will be a Motion for allocation of time to be given to the Evicted Tenants Bill. Proposals for that purpose will be placed on the Paper to-night. On Tuesday and Wednesday the Evicted Tenants Bill will be taken in Committee. On Thursday Irish Estimates—the Chief Secretary's Vote and the Vote for the Agricultural Department. I am not prepared, however, to say in what order they will be taken. I do not think it matters much which comes first.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Yes, it does.

SUPPLY [17TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1907–8.

CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £128,735, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of His Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department and Subordinate Offices."

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.) said it might be convenient to the Committee that he should intervene with a brief statement of the work of his Department on the industrial side. He regretted that the statement had to be made at such a brief interval after the production of the Chief Inspector of Factories' Report, but in face of the complaints continually made of the debate coming on so late in the session he had tried to expedite it. Starting with mines, the subject which chiefly interested those who were concerned —both employers and employed—was the eight-hours day. He hoped shortly to introduce a Government Bill providing that there should be an eight-hours day in mines, and that fact eased his duty on that occasion. The whole subject of safety in mines was still under consideration of a Royal Commission; and, although that did not prevent the Government from taking any measures which might seem necessary for further securing the safety of miners, he thought it best in view of differing opinions as to methods, especially of dealing with ventilation and explosives, to wait until they got the authoritative and considered opinion of the Royal Commission in regard to that question. Another question referred to the Royal Commission related to the sufficiency of the inspectorate of mines. Personally he had come to the conclusion that there should be a distinct mines branch in the Home Office. It appeared to him that this was necessary, but the question was so intimately concerned with the organisation and strength of the mines inspectorate throughout the country that he thought it best to wait for the deliberate opinion of the Commission before anything was done. He hoped that the Commission would report without much delay, but he thought it possible that they might see their way to an interim Report in order to expedite a settlement of this part of the question. It must be a matter of great satisfaction to the Committee that His Majesty had intimated his intention of establishing a medal for gallantry in saving life in mines. Such a recognition supplied a long felt want. Passing to the Report of the chief inspector of factories and workshops, he regarded it as a Report of great interest, a proof of the admirable work done by the official staff, but also of the heavy and perhaps the excessive labour of the present staff of inspectors. The one thing disturbing to his mind was the increased number of accidents. This matter necessarily attracted, and would continue to receive, serious attention. To what the increase was owing was, to some extent, a matter of speculation. Partly it was perhaps owing to an increased use of mechanical power and increased number of factories, and partly to improvement in the reporting of accidents. Among the general causes suggested was the less active supervision by employers consequent on their being covered by insurance. This was always one of the dangers which it was foreseen might accompany legislation on the lines of the Workmen's Compensation Act, and without attributing any special blame to employers, it was but human nature that there should be a relaxation of vigilance when there was no financial responsibility. On the other hand, on reading the Report it was evident that some of the inspectors were impressed, he would not say with the increasing, but continued carelessness on the part of the men. Constant familiarity with danger appeared to blunt the sense of danger; and that in itself created a trade danger, which the Home Office understood, and as far as possible endeavoured to provide against. It was recognised that there must be continued and increased diligence on the part of the inspectorate. Perhaps it would be well that he should mention a certain number of subjects discussed last year so as to show that the Government had been giving to them the promised attention. With regard to fish-curing, that he understood would be raised by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean later on. In regard to African boxwood poisoning, he had directed inquiries to be made. That form of poisoning had been added to the schedule of the Workmen's Compensation Act as an industrial disease. Anthrax had troubled him a good deal, for there had been a considerable increase in the number of cases, and it was very difficult to find a reason for it. He had thought, perhaps, the increased activity in trade might show a greater amount of wool handled, and in some measure account for the increase in cases of anthrax; but the figures did not point to that conclusion. As regarded Persia, the decrease in the number of cases had been from fifteen to nine, but there had been a decrease in the importation of Persian wool from 3,000,000lbs. in 1905 to 832,000lbs. in 1906. As regards East India the figures were for 1905 thirteen cases and for 1906 twelve, while the importation of wool rose from 39,400,000lbs. in 1905 to 46,378,000lbs. in 1906. Thus there seemed to be no relation between the amount of wool handled and the number of cases of anthrax; but the

Home Office were doing everything in their power to investigate the subject, to stimulate inquiry, and to encourage the taking of precautions. A meeting of manufacturers and officials of the Department had been taking place to consider the whole question, and had not yet terminated. He could only hope that science would suggest an absolute remedy for this terrible disease, but if not, at any rate the Department would endeavour by all known methods to safeguard workmen. Then he came to the question of poisoning by anilin and nitro and amido-derivatives of bezene; a Committee had been inquiring into that matter, and such poisoning had been added to the schedule of the Workmen's Compensation Act. A question on which the chief inspector laid considerable stress last year was that of sanitation and the hours of work in the fruit-preserving industry. The hours of work were still too long. Under the new Fruit Preserving Order, which had just been published, an improvement had been effected as regards sanitation, and it was now ordered that no woman or young person under sixteen engaged in this industry should be employed before six in the morning or after ten at night, and in the case of young persons ten hours must elapse between the end of work on one day and the beginning of work on the next. He hoped that by the issue of that Order very material improvement would be effected. The question of time-cribbing was also raised last year. He thought it would probably be agreed that there had been an improvement. Prosecutions had been undertaken and fines had been increased. In all 949 cases had been taken against ninety-one employers and thirty-four employees, and the result had been largely to increase the fines. An important advance made was that the co-operation of the police had been secured in five important centres—namely, Oldham, Accrington, Rochdale, Hyde, and Ashton-under-Lyne. They had had great difficulty in persuading local authorities that they had a responsibility in this matter. All he could say was that every effort would continue to be made to suppress this dishonourable practice, and the Government would be prepared, if necessary, to deal with it by legislation. He passed on to the question of dock inspection. A body of inspectors had been organised, and great improvements had undoubtedly been effected. Fourteen higher grade inspectors' assistants were engaged in the work, and their work had been fruitful of very excellent results. A circular had been issued to shipmasters, shipowners, and shipbuilders with regard to the new regulations, and 6,692 irregularities had been discovered. The number of prosecutions might seem very small in relation to so large a number of irregularities, but it was obvious that shipmasters and owners were unfamiliar with the regulations, and now that they had been warned they would no doubt adhere to them better in the future. Those were the leading subjects on which he was pressed last year, and he hoped the Committee would consider that the Department had been following them up with energy and not without practical success. Perhaps it was due to his Department that he should review briefly the main lines of duty which imposed such severe work upon it. At the present time they were conducting, or others were conducting on their behalf, many important inquiries. There were four Royal Commissions still at work—Commissions on Safety in Mines, on Vivisection, on the Metropolitan Police, and on the Care of the Feeble-minded, the reference to the last having been extended to the administration of the Lunacy Acts—and a number of Departmental Committees. He included the Committee on the Truck Acts, the Mines (Eight Hours) Committee which he was glad to say had finished its labours and reported, and the Committee dealing with Industrial Diseases, which, thanks to the extraordinary zeal of his hon. friend the Member for the Cleveland Division and his colleagues, had added eighteen types of industrial disease to the schedule of the Workmen's Compensation Act, and thus redeemed the promises made last year on the subject. They had had Committees of inquiry into the ambulance system of the metropolis, into the prevention of accidents in building operations, and into the best means of determining wages due when paid by measurement or weight of material handled or produced. He was glad to be able to say that the last-named Committee had come to a unanimous conclusion, and he hoped on the Report which would be presented they would be able to settle the vexed question which had disturbed the minds of his predecessors for the last fifteen years. Then they had dispatched a Commissioner to Australia and New Zealand to investigate the results of legislation with regard to wages boards, home work, and shop hours in those Colonies. He mentioned all these, not for their intrinsic interest, but to show the House that all these Commissions and Committees imposed a very serious labour upon his Department. What between secretarial work, serving on Commissions and Committees, giving evidence before them, and the work of communications on the various subjects being considered, these inquiries entailed constant and daily labour on the Department. He would also remind the House in passing that last year's legislation had materially interfered with the energies of his Department, which had been responsible or guilty for adding nine Acts to the Statute Book, including the Workmen's Compensation Act, and others of minor importance, such as the Betting and the Copyright Acts, but which entailed great labour. He would now pass to the other work of the Department and summarise what had been done on the industrial side. Two sets of regulations had been made, first in regard to paints and colours containing lead, and secondly with regard to locomotives in factories. Four sets of regulations had been issued in draft; first, as to the manufacture of hemp and jute with a view to the diminution of dust; secondly, in regard to the handling of horse hair, to guard against anthrax; thirdly, with regard to the heading of yarn (in the preparation of which lead compounds had been used); and fourthly, with regard to the casting of brass. In addition, three sets of draft regulations were in course of preparation relating to the use of electricity in factories, aniline and di-nitro benzol processes, and tinning and enamelling. In five more cases inquiries were proceeding with the same object, viz., steel-grinding, East India wool, lucifer matches, building operations, and earthenware and china. They had also sent out many circulars, three only of which he would mention. They had sent out an important circular to Coroners dealing, among other things, with the new Notice of Accidents Act, and the representation of trade unions at inquests, a second large circular to employers calling their attention to recent legislation, and a third circular to medical officers of health with regard to the employment of women before and after childbirth. He now passed to Orders. They had made one Home Work Order and two Particulars Orders, one relating to a number of manufactures, of which the most important was boots and shoes, and one to net-making, pea-picking, etc. A third relating to the brass trade was also under consideration, and they had been in communication with the employers and with the workmen's representatives in regard to it. In addition they had received, as a result of local and other inquiries, eight important reports. One related to exhaust ventilation for the removal of dust, and they were about to start another with regard to the conditions of labour where a high degree of humidity was found in combination with a high degree of temperature. They had had an inquiry into an important case at Moreland's match factory, and it showed that the accident was due to causes which preceded the special regulations which had since been brought into force. There had also been inquiries into accidents and the fencing of machinery in the cotton districts, and as to the incidence of anthrax from the use of horse hair and bristles, Hon. Members had further had a report giving preliminary statistics of accidents and poisoning. This was a new departure which he thought would be of some convenience. They had now a Return of the previous year's accidents and poisoning cases early in the year instead of waiting for their publication in the Report of the chief inspector. That Return had been laid on the Table this year for the first time. There was one other subject with which he thought it necessary to deal. Last year, with the sanction of the Treasury, he increased the factory department staff by adding four inspectors, three lady inspectors, and four inspectors' assistants. He thought that was not bad for a start. He had also fulfilled his promise of going into the question of the position of the factory inspectors' assistants. He considered that a material and not unsatisfactory advance had been made, and he believed the result would be to encourage a very deserving class of public servants. New duties had also been allocated to them. He did not say that they had arrived at a final arrangement in the matter, but the whole of the higher grade assistants had now other duties than they used to perform in connection with docks, time-cribbing, and other matters. That was a beginning, at any rate. One of the assistants had been promoted to the rank of inspector. Fourteen of the higher grade inspectors had had duties allocated to them in connection with dock inspection. When he considered the added field of inspection, he found it impossible to be satisfied with the present condition of affairs. The staff at present comprised 110 inspectors, including the headquarters staff; thirteen lady inspectors; one inspector and four assistant inspectors of textile particulars; and forty inspectors' assistants; making a total of 168. That was a large body, but when one remembered that there were 106,000 factories and 142,000 workshops in the country, and considering other figures relating to their field of work, it was clear that a staff of 168 persons, however zealous, could not possibly cover the multifarious duties cast upon them under the Factory and Workshop Act. Not only was the field too wide for the labourers to deal with, but year by year the work was increasing in complexity and in difficulty. Year by year the need made itself felt of men of the highest possible intelligence, qualification, and training. A further increase was necessary in justice to the staff and in justice to the industrial population. The chief inspector was preparing statistics with regard to the five main divisions into which the country was divided, and the 47 districts into which it was subdivided in order to arrive, as far as possible, at an accurate idea of what was essential at the present time. As soon as this had been done the question of the increase of the staff would be considered. He had already taken steps in regard to this matter. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was not present and he had not been in any official communication with him at the present time, but he had had some conversation with him on the subject. He had to report that the conversation was of an extremely friendly character, and it encouraged him to hope that there might be an increase in the number of inspectors on the staff. That was really all he had to say at the outset of the question, but he thought it best to draw the attention of the Committee to certain details of the work which had occupied them during the last year. He wished, however, to show the Committee that the discussion last year had borne its fruit, and he only wished he could show a better record. He did not, however, think it was a bad one. He could only say this on their behalf, that the work of the Department last year showed an increase of twenty per cent. All, therefore, he could say was that they had been continually in a state of activity up to the limit of their means. He would also like to remind the House that out of the twenty months in which he had had the honour of holding his office fourteen had been in the session of Parliament. That, of course, involved costly and sometimes disastrous interference with Departmental work, because not only was there legislative work to be done, but there had to be constant attendance at the House and all that that attendance meant in the way of interruption to a Home Secretary. He was sorry to put it so high, but there was no doubt that each session did bring to the Home Secretary hundreds of questions with or without notice, and of late activity in regard to these queries had been unusual. There, had, however been in the last twelve months continuous and concentrated work in the sub-departments of the Home Office, but undoubtedly with no autumn session there was a better prospect before them this year and they would do their best.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said the first part of the statement of his right hon. friend in regard to the industrial work of his Department dealt with the mines, on which other Members meant to speak. He thought he could leave to his hon. friends the discussion of the steps which should be taken to secure greater safety in mines and of improvements in regard to the inspectorate both as to mines and factories and workshops. He had no doubt the hon. Member for Leicester would follow him upon the latter point. There also he would not intervene except to say that it was impossible to read the annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops for 1906 without seeing the effect already of the additions which had been made in the women's departments in giving them power to do that work which they so wished to do. Those additions gave them power to cope with arrears of work by allowing members of the staff to be detached for separate inquiries and separate duties. There were two points in connection with industrial disease with which, however, he would like to deal. There was an allusion in the Report to the International Conference at Berne, but the matter was so completely discussed in the House of Lords on the Motion of Lord Lytton that he did not think they would be likely to raise any new points if they discussed it that day. Therefore he did not propose to do so. The point which Lord Lytton had at heart was one form of industrial poisoning which was not so important as others which had been mentioned, namely, yellow phosphorus poisoning in the match trade, and he named it that day chiefly because we had proceeded in this country in recent years to deal with the matter, and perhaps held ourselves up to the contempt of other nations, by stating that we had adopted a particular course which would put an end to industrial poisoning without prohibiting the use of the dangerous material itself used in the industry. At the International Conference at Berne we told the other Powers that we could deal with phosphorus and lead poisoning by means of special rules and special regulations and that we could stop phosphorus necrosis by these special precautions. Unfortunately at that moment there was the outbreak of phosphorus necrosis to which his right hon. friend had alluded in his speech. His case was that there were efficient commercial substitutes for the use of lead or phosphorus. Of course the Committee knew that the "strike-on-the-box" matches were made from safe phosphorus, and it was the "strike-anywhere" matches from which the danger arose. If there was an efficient substitute it should be used. There was a French patent which had this result, and there was also a German patent which the Government of that country bought up and presented to the trade. Another substitute was used in the matches of Bryant and May, who used to be offenders in this respect, but whose matches were now safe. It was a commercial substitute, because it had been found that the use of yellow phosphorus was not necessary for cheapness. If they could also find a commercial substitute for the use of lead it became incumbent upon them to put a stop to those horrible forms of disease and suffering which were placed before them year by year in this Report. Before the International Conference at Berne, there was a prohibition against the use of yellow phosphorus in matches in France, Germany, Holland, Denmark and Switzerland, and Italy had now also decided to take that step. In the United Kingdom reliance was placed upon special rules, and revision of these was under consideration. As to anthrax, there was no reason to discuss it, because there had been no retrogression of policy, but in the case of lead poisoning there had been a retrogression in policy. The Report of the Departmental Committee on compensation for industrial diseases in the pottery trade showed that they came to a negative conclusion as to one of them, although but for a single word it might be taken for an affirmative one. They said that after much anxious consideration they had arrived at the conclusion that potters' rot was a trade disease sufficiently distinguishable and specific to employment, but they said they could not recommend the immediate addition of this disease to the schedule. That was the conclusion arrived at, that it was a trade disease sufficiently distinguishable and specific to employment, but they could not recommend the immediate addition of this disease to the schedule. It was a curious fact that the *Staffordshire Sentinel*, which was the journal of the pottery trade both of masters and men, published the opposite conclusion in large type, and four or five days were allowed to elapse before the contradiction was allowed to become public, which looked as though there must have been some changes made at the last moment. However that might be, potters' rot was not to be treated as a disease for compensation. The other disease of the potter's trade was a very clear cause of horrible suffering which had been reduced and could be remedied by the action of this House. The reports showed that there was an increase in lead poisoning, not in the potteries only, but generally. From the Report of the Home Office the cases of lead poisoning which were the subject of Reports through the Home Office in 1905 were 209, while in 1906 they were 280. Some time ago the employment of women in white-lead making was entirely prevented, but in spite of the prevention the poisoning of women in white-lead works was rising rapidly. That subject was discussed at great length in the reports, and the statement upon the subject by the inspectors was that their attention had, as usual, been more claimed by cases of injury through lead than by any other cause, and the deplorable incidence of plumbism among girls, in transfer-making and in glass sign enamelling. Then there were the special reports of Miss Paterson on "Plumbism among women in subsidiary processes in white-lead works and amongst girls painting tape measures." The chief inspector, Miss Anderson, pointed out that—

> "making transfers was a very serious cause of cases of plumbism among young girls."

As also was the enamelling of glass signs, which she stated was—

> "equally dangerous, that it was not a skilled occupation, and young girls were generally employed."

Miss Vines stated that there were seven cases of lead poisoning, six of them girls under twenty, from one transfer works in the Staffordshire potteries in fourteen months, and, in addition, there was a girl of fifteen who died suddenly under suspicious circumstances. She went on to show that there was—

> "in 1906, as compared with 1905, in earthenware and china works, a rise of twenty-three cases, of which four, or one more than in 1905, were fatal. In the present year there has been a further increase in fatal cases."

Miss Vines, the special woman inspector, stated that—

> "the extremely high temperatures in dipping and ware-cleaning, and the heavy straining nature of the work done by the women engaged in lead processes contributed to lead poisoning, and expressed opinion that great heat predisposed to plumbism."

That view was confirmed by high medical authority. The horrible amount of suffering and the great increase of fatal cases was accompanied by something which the Return did not shew, namely, an alarming increase in infant mortality, and an alarming increase of still-births. The statements as to infant mortality were terrible. The statements began with this. In Tunstall, where they were surprised at the present infant mortality, they gave cases of the effect of the cleaning of the dipping-house boards which were coated with lead glazes, and the wiping up of the tubs, and the Inspectors declared that the work was quite unsuited to women and girls. Then followed the reports of the medical officers of health in all the pottery towns for the previous year, which were terrible reading. The infant mortality, 1,100 or 1,200 deaths a year, was largely attributed by the medical officers to the women being employed in the china and earthenware works. The general statement made by the Home Office was that—

> "this high mortality is undoubtedly largely due to the extensive employment of married women in the earthenware and china works."

When they came to the reports of the medical officers they found the medical officer for Longton describing it as—

> "a regular slaughter of the innocents every year;"

The medical officer for Hanley as—

> "high infantile mortality;"

The medical officer for Stoke said—

> "the infantile death rate was higher than for the previous two years . . . the rate for England was lower . . . the borough compared very unfavourably with it, and with that for the larger towns."

The medical officer for Tunstall referred to the—

> "high rate of infant mortality, and said surely some remedies ought speedily to be brought to bear."

The medical officer for Burslem said—

> "how unfavourably in the matter of infantile mortality Burslem compared with other districts."

The medical officer for Fenton drew attention to—

> "the large proportion of deaths among young children."

Those were the official facts, and they were getting worse. The service of the Lead Fund Committee was named, but this subject could not be left to private individuals. One defect was pointed out in the earthenware and china rules with regard to the washing of the overalls and the clothing of those employed. That, he imagined, was a matter that could be attended to without legislation. It was a defect in the order and not in the law. And then there was the necessity of clearing up the "moist conditions." But, the larger points that were dealt with by the chief medical inspector in his statistics of the lead-poisoning cases could not be explained away in the manner in which he attempted to do. In the Report there was a footnote which explained the unsoundness of these statistics. In admitting the fatal cases and discussing them more in detail, the Chief Inspector used some words that he would like to mention to the House. With regard to the tinning and enamelling of hollow vessels, the words of the chief Medical Inspector were—

> "All the workers at this process become infected."

That was a terrible admission, and he believed that in Germany, in this matter, they were far ahead of us. A Question was asked by his hon. friend the Member for Bradford on the 22nd March with regard to the number of fatal cases, and it was stated that there had been four fatal cases in the china and earthenware trade as compared with one in the previous year. There had been four in two months, six in the first six months and now seven. This proportion of fatal cases in the china and earthenware industry was the subject of a Question, and his right hon. friend the Secretary of State honestly announced—

> "I do not think any explanation can be given of the number of deaths for this year."

As to the use of leadless glaze, Miss Vines in her report made an observation with regard to it which he regretted, because the process had answered most successfully. On page 218, dealing with leadless ware, she said—

> "I am told that by the use of leadless glaze all or most of the characteristics of earthenware would be at once destroyed."

That was simply not the case. Anyone who had visited the leadless glaze works at Bristol would there see that the real characteristics of earthenware were preserved by the leadless process, even in the cheap ware. Of that there could be no doubt. She quoted a manufacturer as having said—

> "It rests with the public. If they demand a leadless glaze they would have to forego . . . . brilliant and beautiful colours."

Then she went on to say that an eminent potter had reported—

> "Tender-souled people talk about leadless glaze . . . . but there is less than one-fifth as much made in Staffordshire that there was five years ago."

In the use of leadless glaze it was not necessary to forego the use of the most beautiful colours, and they could have the most perfect dinner and tea service with the use of leadless glaze. He would undertake to show Members of the House articles which were as beautiful as anything ever produced in the history of the world—English objects produced within the last year, all absolutely leadless, and all the most difficult colours accomplished—vermilion, scarlet, Indian red, etc.—thus showing what, by experiment and taking trouble, could be done. Those who had been engaged in this agitation for years to overcome the objections to leadless ware had succeeded in getting what they wanted, at the usual cost, though with a great deal of trouble, he admitted. There was a body of opinion among manufacturers against the leadless glaze, and they had to insist upon getting what they asked for; it involved some trouble, and they had to wait some time. It might be that the quality and colour of the leadless ware were the result of peculiar care. When once they induced manufacturers to undertake its production it was probable that they bestowed greater pains upon and watched more closely the manufacture under a new process, where they were trying an experiment. Of course, it was very difficult for private individuals to meet statements as to the deterioration of leadless ware, because they had to consider the treatment it received. For instance, if it were used for certain tooth powders or washes, its colour might be affected by the strong astringents or acids brought to bear upon it. He was happy to think that Miss Vines herself partly answered her quotations. She said "supineness" and "apathy" had been shown in "experimenting." If there had been a falling off it had been in the orders from the Government Departments. He should very much doubt, after the Leadless Glaze Exhibition at the Church House last autumn, that there had not been an increased demand on the part of the public for this ware, though great difficulties had been thrown in their way. He was going to do a very foolish thing, and he was going to do it deliberately, which was invariable where foolish things were done; he was going to criticise a distinguished Civil servant. He knew that attacks on Civil servants were deprecated because they were not present to defend themselves. In this instance the official was most hard working, most talented, and most artistic and imaginative. There was a lecture given by Mr. Burton on the 30th April at the Society of Arts, which was reported at the time, and there was another report of it in the *Journal of the Society of Arts* published on the 7th June.

A distinguished Member of the House was in the chair. Mr. Burton was one of the greatest of English potters as regarded knowledge of the trade and its conditions. Mr. H. H. Cunynghame, of the Home Office, was present at the lecture, and he made a speech with regard to pottery. The chairman had spoken of lustre ware, beautiful specimens of which Mr. Burton had exhibited. There was nothing controversial in Mr. Burton's lecture, and he never used the word "lead." He had the two reports, that which was taken at the time and the official corrected report, and the word "lead" did not appear. Having been called upon by the chairman to take part in the discussion, Mr. Cunynghame said—

> "He took it that the beautiful pieces exhibited were heavily leaded and could not be produced without lead."

The full report ran as follows—

> "Some years ago . . . there was a movement on foot, conducted by philanthropic people, who urged that the use of lead in pottery should be forbidden, because a certain number of the potters were poisoned. It was thought by those who were advising the Government that it was possible to use lead without danger."

He did not think that was the view of those who advised the Government at that time, because the Home Office offered totally to prohibit the use of lead to an extent over 2 per cent. That percentage scarcely meant the use of lead at all, and the ware would be almost leadless. Mr. Cunynghame went on to say—

> "Wiser counsels now prevail."

He did not understand that there had been any admission on the part of the Home Office that there had been a change of policy, except as to the possibility of obtaining local assent sufficient to carry their rules. Then Mr. Cunynghame further said that he would not—

> "rashly press changes which . . . would ruin a national industry. . . It was impossible to produce the finest class of work without the use of lead. In the beautiful specimens exhibited by Mr. Burton a considerable amount of lead glaze had been used, and it would, therefore, be a thousand pities if anybody pressed upon the industry a total prohibition of that material, which, with discrimination, could be used with perfect safety."

To speak of "ruining a national industry" was a terribly exaggerated statement. According to those of his way of thinking it was without foundation; and according to those who might think it had some foundation, it was a great exaggeration, even from their point of view. Then Mr. Cunynghame took the general position that "the most dangerous chemicals could be used with perfect safety," if with proper precautions. That was a policy to which he and others took exception. Mr. Burton in reply said that, although—

> "most of the pieces exhibited were leaded, beautiful results could be obtained with both. . . The old Persian lustre was made on leadless glaze, and some of his pieces were on leadless glaze."

The report at the time was—

> "You can obtain very beautiful results with a leadless glaze, but not the same results."

The results might be different, but it took a skilled eye to discover that lead had been used, and often an analysis had to be resorted to. He would not detain the Committee further upon that point. The Home Office had published a table giving a list of manufacturers to whom they offered advantages for using leadless glaze, glaze under 2 per cent., and glaze under 5 per cent. In the year 1898 the Home Office addressed a communication to all the Departments and sent them reports in favour of leadless glaze and advised them that—

> "In making or renewing contracts leadless-glaze ware should be specified."

He did not know whether Mr. Cunynghame advised that policy or not, but that was the policy at that time. Even the War Office was forced by the action of the Home Office, against the wishes of the manufacturers, to place this stipulation in the contracts which were operative from the 1st February, 1900, for three years. The manufacturers alleged that certain articles could not be supplied in leadless glaze, but the War Office in those contracts insisted absolutely upon leadless glaze, although it was argued that there would be delay. That, of course, was the ordinary excuse made when a customer insisted upon some change in the manufacture of an article. In 1901 the Office of Works and the Treasury sent out a circular in favour of leadless glaze, and in that year an Answer was given as to the use of leadless glaze by the Post Office, in which it was stated that the Postmaster-General hoped to overcome the difficulty so that none but insulators treated with leadless glaze would be used. In this instance there had been retrogression, because he found that a report had been received from the late Chief

Engineer proposing to discontinue the whole use of leadless glaze. The highest scientific authority which the Government could consult on this matter was of opinion that there was no ground for retrogression. He knew that the Postmaster-General was entirely upon their side in this matter, although he had great difficulty in inducing certain permanent officials to believe that leadless glaze was as good as others. There had in this matter been retrogression all round at the War Office and the Admiralty, although the Home Office and the Treasury had told them to use leadless glaze in all their contracts. The only Answer given on this subject since the present Government came into office was given by the Chief Commissioner of Works, against whom he had not the slightest complaint, because he had taken every step that was possible to secure the object in view. His reply was—

> "The advice of this Office has not been sought lately by the Departments mentioned."

That was a retrogression, because formerly the other Departments were willing to seek advice from the Office of Works in making contracts. The Office of Works had taken steps to bring up to their leadless level the refreshment departments of all Offices. There was a Home Office list given of the firms complying with the leadless, the 2 per cent. and the 5 per cent. standards on page 181 of the Report, but it should not be overlooked that there were a good many firms manufacturing leadless pottery who did not come to the Government at all in this matter and who did not appear in this large list of firms, which gave a very wide field of choice. He apologised for having detained the Committee so long upon this question of dangerous processes, but he had done so because he felt that it was one in which they had gone backward instead of forward. Another matter he wished to allude to concerned the emergency processes. The fruit and fish-curing exemptions were notoriously admitted to be very dangerous exemptions from the law. Those exemptions were bitterly opposed in 1895, and also in 1901, when the Factory Bills were before the House. His right hon. friend had said there had been an improvement as regarded jam, though he admitted that the hours were dangerously long. He had said there was to be a new Jam Order, but that would not limit the hours in a very great degree, because it allowed work between 6 a.m. and 10 p.m. which were long hours. He and others also fought the previous Jam Order in this House, and they discussed it until a very late hour, but they were beaten. The Report now showed that everything they prophesied then had come true. Women were working from 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. on four days a week, and on five consecutive days sometimes. Young Persons were working from 6.0 a.m. to 9.30 p.m. in these horrible places in July, and the inspectors pointed out that these long hours were "unnecessary." That was exactly his contention. The Report stated—

> "All concerned are distressingly overworked. There is confusion resulting from the multiplicity of exceptions and unlimited hours of work. In no instance is this limited exactly to cleaning and preparing fruit, and something additional is always done. The greatest difficulty is found in ascertaining that the Order of the Secretary of State is being observed. Illegality is frequent, though evidence sufficient to base a prosecution on, is not established."

With regard to the fish-curing exemption they were told in the Report—

> "The time is not ripe for further comment upon the condition of the fish-curing industry."

In the Report of the Midland Division they were told that there were—

> "no complaints in respect of fish-curing except in regard to emergency processes at Grimsby."

That was the very point. There seemed to be a curious concealment about this matter, and in Scotland the annual Report informed them that the fish-curing establishments at Aberdeen were much better on account of the efforts of the sanitary authority at Aberdeen, but very bad elsewhere, although "elsewhere" was not explained. There had been Reports from Medical Officers in Scotland on this subject called for by the action of the Home Office. He asked for those Reports not long ago, and they were refused—quite properly, no doubt—on the ground that they would be very costly to print. That statement was not accompanied by the usual intimation that those interested could see the Reports. He had not seen them and they had not been seen, so far as he knew, by anyone outside the Home Office. He was sure that they were

Reports which under proper discretion should be shown to anyone interested in the question. Some action had been taken for the purpose of preventing the extraordinarily long hours worked by women in the making-up departments of florists' shops in London. Several hon. Members interfered, and expressed themselves hostile to the action taken by the women inspectors. In the Report it was pointed out that the women were working fifteen hours a day. They also worked on Sunday. He could not conceive why they should work these hours, and if the inspectors believed that their intervention was required, that should hardly be made a matter of complaint. He would suggest that the blame here, as in the case of dressmaking, lay with those who gave orders which could not be executed in the time allowed without involving a great deal of distressing over-employment of women who were not regularly employed all through the year. It was a case in which the public sinned through ignorance, and the more public attention was called to the real cause the better it would be for those concerned. He thanked the Home Secretary for the form in which the Particulars Order had been finally issued. He thanked the right hon. Gentleman also for the inquiries to which he had referred, almost all of which had been thoroughly beneficial. Insurance under the Compensation Act had been the subject of a promise of two inquiries. He had read with the greatest admiration the evidence given by the Under-Secretary of State (Mr. Herbert Samuel) before the smaller one. The larger issue in connection with that question would have to be inquired into. He would not enlarge on the reasons which made the inquiry necessary. The only other inquiry to which he would refer was one to be held in regard to the fair wages clause. Questions had recently been asked in this House as to the possibility of interference to prevent preference being given to non-unionist firms. If that inquiry was held it should not be confined to an inquiry into facts which were the subject of inquiry some years ago by a Committee of this House, but it should deal with the larger questions which had been raised.

*MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester) said the Home Secretary was mistaken in stating that there had been an objection raised to the taking of this Vote earlier in the year. That was not the point to which objection had been taken. The point was that this year the factory inspector's Report was not published until 11th July and that they were asked to discuss it to-day. Last year the Report was published a day earlier and the Home Office Vote was taken on 1st August. He and his friends would be only too delighted if the Home Secretary would let them have the Report a few weeks earlier, but what they did object to was that this important document of 400 pages which was delivered to members last Friday morning should be discussed that day.

*MR. GLADSTONE said that if he had known there was an objection to the Vote being taken that day, he would have made representations at once in order that a more convenient day might be found. He thought it was known that the Vote was coming on that day. Questions had been asked several times as to when the Report would be published and he had the impression that hon. Members wished the Vote to be taken that day.

*MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD said that his complaint was that whoever was responsible for fixing the date for the discussion of the Home Office Vote had not the courtesy to inform the Labour Party when it was coming on. The Prime Minister's announcement last Thursday was the first information they had that the Vote was coming on that day. The usual procedure in such a case was to fix the dates in consultation with those who were specially interested in particular Votes. It was perfectly well known that the Labour Members were very much interested in this discussion, but no approach was made to them and no agreement was come to. He did not blame the Home Secretary himself, but it was to be hoped that in future years the same mistake would not be made. In his criticisms he would confine himself to the question of factory inspection and the organisation of the factory inspection staff. The time at his disposal would not enable him to say the nice things he would like to say of part of the work of the right hon. Gentleman's staff, and if what he had to say took the form mainly of criticism, the right hon. Gentleman could understand that behind his criticism there was a great deal of appreciation. He was very glad to hear the admission of the Home Secretary that the dual control of certain things provided for by the Factory and Workshops Act had broken down. He and other Members had predicted years ago that it would break down, and they thought that the Home Office should make itself absolutely responsible for those things. He ventured to make an appeal that medical officers of health, if they were really going to be allowed to exercise any authority under the Factory and Workshops Act, should be removed from the control of local authorities. If the medical officer was the servant of a small local authority, the members of which were in so many instances interested in the property and in the malpractices that went on in connection with home work, how could it be expected that either the medical officer or the local authority would carry out the law in the same way as the Home Office acting through national inspectors would do?

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) asked whether that remark applied also to large local authorities.

*MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD said he could give the names of large local authorities as well as small local authorities which had acted in this objectionable way. He was extremely sorry that the Home Secretary in appointing the Committee on Home Work had not put any outsiders on it. No women had been appointed on it.

*MR. GLADSTONE pointed out that nobody but Members could sit on Select Committees. Such a Committee was inevitable sooner or later because so many novel proposals had been made to deal with sweating in the homes of the workers. The Committee, however, did not take the place of any inquiry that might be necessary on the subject, but was appointed with a view to considering legislative action to solve the difficulty.

*MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD thanked the right hon. Gentleman for his explanation. He did not want to pursue the subject very far, but he would urge one point. If legislation was to be proposed after the Select Committee reported, he thought an inquiry into sweating and the conditions of sweating should have preceded the appointment of the Select Committee. In his opinion the Home Secretary had put the cart before the horse. The importance of the question of inspectors could not be over-estimated. His right hon. friend had brought before the House some very important points. He wanted to urge upon the Committee that a very large part of the failure of the administration of the law was owing to the inefficient machinery they had created for administering the law. Last year he pointed out that very foolish distinctions existed between what were known as inspectors and assistant inspectors. First of all, he called attention to the fact that the monthly circulars, full of important information, were withheld from assistant inspectors. Nobody had been able to explain this except by the "class" reason that the inspector was a superior officer to the assistant inspector. The efficiency of the work was thus impaired by some edict of the Department according to which assistant inspectors were not put in possession of the material which was necessary to efficiency. There was absolutely no reason why there should be this distinction. Then he wished to know why assistant inspectors were not more frequently asked to attend inquests. Last year there were 1,116 fatal accidents, but only on six occasions were assistant inspectors called in to assist at inquests, and in four of those cases the inspector was present as well. A very serious boiler explosion took place in South London, resulting in the death of two men, but, despite the fact that the two inspectors' assistants in the district were practical engineers, one having been a marine engineer and a boiler maker, neither of them was called to put his knowledge and experience at the disposal of the State and of the people affected. South London was one of the most industrial districts of the country, and yet experienced assistant inspectors there were given duties to perform which any schoolboy might do. It was perfectly true that the right hon. Gentleman had somewhat improved the position with regard to lead-poisoning, but there had been eighty-five cases of lead-poisoning in coach-building, an increase of 50 per cent. in 1905. An inspectors' assistant was able to go into a coach-makers' place and advise the proprietor regarding the precautions he was taking, but, if an actual case of poisoning occurred, the assistant could no longer act. He had no *status*, and the ordinary inspector had to be sent for to go over the work with which the assistant had been charged. There was also the question which he asked the right hon. Gentleman regarding the power of inspector's assistants to enter factories. The right hon. Gentleman replied that it depended upon the district superintendent inspector. He was bound to say he did not quite understand what that reply meant. The warrant of inspectors' assistants entitled them to enter workshops, and, when the higher grade assistants were created, their new warrants entitled them to enter factories. How could inspectors' assistants, without that amended warrant, be entitled upon the order of a superintendent inspector to enter factories? As a matter of fact, they did not enter factories, and, so far as they could find out, no such order as he had referred to had been issued. Lady inspectors, with infinitely less experience, entered factories, and made most valuable reports. Why should not inspectors' assistants have the same facilities as the lady inspectors who had less experience in precisely the same sort of work? The question very seriously affected the existence of overtime in both factories and workshops. Inspectors' assistants might see lights in what appeared to be a workshop, but which might be a factory. They never quite knew whether they were entitled to enter. In the first blush of his enthusiasm an inspector's assistant would undoubtedly enter, but at last he began to settle down, and, because he was often thrown back from the door of a factory, he ultimately ceased to be an efficient inspector for detecting overtime in workshops.

*MR. GLADSTONE said that as a matter of fact four inspectors' assistants were engaged in the work of factory inspection, and there was no finality about the change.

*MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD said he was coming to that. He hoped his criticisms would help the right hon. Gentleman to come nearer to perfect finality. If the right hon. Gentleman would seriously inquire into the evil effect of inspectors' assistants being hampered in this way, he felt perfectly certain he would discover a state of mind in assistant inspectors which he would see it was his duty to remove by changing the conditions under which they did their work. The right hon. Gentleman last year told them that the position of inspectors' assistants was an anomaly which could not be maintained, and he had undoubtedly done something to make changes. He had for instance, enabled some inspectors' assistants to visit docks, but if there happened to be a warehouse at the dock using machinery precisely the same as was used in the docks as part and parcel of the dock work, he could not enter. He was bound to pass that factory, and the ordinary inspector had to tread upon his footsteps. Certain inspectors' assistants were undoubtedly allowed to examine and inspect for time cribbing, but under what conditions? They might enter a factory before or after the legal hours, but they were not allowed to be inside during them. Another improvement which the right hon. Gentleman had made was very limited in its scope. The other day he allowed three inspectors' assistants to sit for an examination, and one passed. That was a most inadequate way of meeting the promise he gave last year, seeing that there was much leeway to make up. If the right hon. Gentleman looked at the Civil Service Commissioners' Report he would find that the difference between the three in marks was infinitesimal. Surely he was treating the matter in a petty-fogging way in dealing with it as he had done. He nominated three inspector's assistants to sit for this examination, and then although they had evidence that they would all be competent inspectors, yet two were rejected and one was passed. It must be remembered that this was not an open examination of outsiders. It was a test imposed upon men who, after ten or fourteen years service, were chafing under the limitation imposed upon them in regard to their service of the State. That was a very inadequate fulfilment of the promise that the right hon. Gentleman gave a year ago. Owing to the short time he had had to examine this Report he was in some difficulty, but he thought he was correct in saying there was no account given as usual of the number of miles travelled by factory inspectors and of their inspections. If this information was in the Report it was not in its old place. It was a very serious omission, and he could not see why it was made except to avoid showing the very serious defects in the organisation of the staff. The right hon. Gentleman himself had said that those figures were an indication of the way in which the staff was organised, and the greater the number of miles travelled the more the inefficiency of the organisation of the staff was shown. He also complained of the artificial distinctions which existed in regard to the staff, and said that the failure to visit factories was becoming very alarming. It appeared that 6,700 had not been visited since 1904, and as many as 14,500 were not visited in 1906. That was a reduction of 500 on 1905, taking the figures from the Blue Book, and he did not think that such a reduction showed that there had been any praiseworthy effort made. There was unnecessary duplication of working, owing to inspectors for different purposes being sent to the same place, and he knew of a case where three Government inspectors visited the same building and there were four local inspectors visiting it as well. Their duties were quite separate, and not one of them could do the work of each other's department. The right hon. Gentleman complained about his Department being overworked, but it appeared that all Departments were overworked, and he thought that a great deal of labour might be saved if this one were more soundly organised. Nor was he convinced that this Department had got the best material for its purpose. Better material was to be had to carry on its work, and it was possible to set about getting that material in a better way. If he had had any doubt on that subject it would have been dispelled by a recent visit abroad where he went into the question of the appointment of factory inspectors in the countries which he visited. They were admirably organised, and did their work in an admirable way. These countries did not adopt the superficial and artificial plan of selecting men by an examination which had nothing to do with the work which they would be required to perform. The Return of the staff and the occupations of its members before appointment which had been presented to this House on his Motion was very interesting, and showed that there was a change in 1900 and 1901 in the tests imposed upon the candidates for inspectorships. Before that date the lists of candidates were practically one long repetition of "engineer," "engineer," "engineer." When they came to 1901 and 1902, however, they got a different class of men including analysts, university men of different degrees, a schoolmaster, a confidential clerk in a linen factory, a manager, science lecturers, electrical engineers, and others. A paper on English literature was set to test the capacity of men to protect the lives of people working where machinery was in operation. One of the questions was "How does the Shakespeare Comedy resemble and differ from the Ben Jonson. Illustrate your answer." Such a test was absurd unless it was so designed to select factory inspectors from the class possessing social distinction. The right hon. Gentleman had done something to meet them, but, taken as a whole the organisation of the factory department no longer commanded confidence. The Factory and Workshops Act required stiffening and supplementing at a good many points. The condition and organisation of the staff, the administratian of the Act, and the alterations required in the law might very well be made the subject of inquiry by a committee of experts in order to guide the right hon. Gentleman in his future action. He was satisfied that there would be a recommendation that more assistant inspectors should be created, and that there ought to be a system under which they should be passed up in accordance with the efficiency they showed in administering the powers conferred upon them. Another point which he thought would be recommended was that the walls between the different portions of the staff should be broken down so that it should be a coherent whole, and so that the members might rise to the position to which they were entitled. The local superintendent inspectors should have more power than they now had to give directions as to how their assistants should occupy themselves. A complete change also should be made in the examinations now imposed on inspectors so as to bring them into closer touch with industrial life and life in the workshops. The head of the Department should not be a medical officer of health. He believed an impartial inquiry would recommend such changes, and if the changes were made he felt perfectly certain that the taxpayers' money would be saved, that the Department would be more efficient and better men would be found to go on the staff. In spite of the improvements made by the right hon. Gentleman he still thought it would be possible to make much greater improvements.

MR. BRACE (Glamorganshire, S.) said he desired to associate himself with every word of appreciation which had been uttered with regard to the action taken by His Majesty in connection with the mining industry. For a long time his attention had been directed to this matter, but in his most sanguine moments he never anticipated that His Majesty would have taken the action he had. He had also been much interested in what the right hon. Gentlemen had said with regard to the Eight Hours Bill, and hoped that it would be soon introduced. He also rejoiced in the statement that it was the right hon. Gentleman's intention to reorganise the Home Office, and that a purely mining section was to be established. He ventured to express the hope that in the reorganisation of that Office, with especial reference to mining, the right hon. Gentleman would give particular attention to considering the desirability of having a direct representative of labour attached to the Home Office staff. He had always felt that both the workmen and the Home Office lost considerably by having no direct connection between the miners and the administrative Department. He, however, rose for the purpose of dealing with two questions of first importance to the miners of this country, and of Wales in particular. He had recently received the very important Report of Mr. Atkinson and Mr. Lewis on the colliery accident in Genwen, and was particularly impressed with the way in which the inspectors reported. The point on which they thought there was a direct considerable and serious breach of the rules was the fact that—

> "The firemen reported that if they found gas and cleared it out of the way they did not enter it upon their report, and the finding of the gas was never reported. General Rule 4 requires a report specifying where noxious or inflammable gas, if any, was found present. It seems evident that the manager took no steps to ensure full compliance with this rule. No record of persons allowed to have lamp keys was kept, as required by Special Rule 183. The main separation doors between the intake and the return air currents consisted of a wooden door and a canvas sheet, whereas Special Rule 73 requires that all main doors are double."

The inspectors very properly took proceedings against the colliery owners in consequence of the violation of the rules, and they were convicted and fined £5 and costs. What he desired to ask was, what earthly advantage was it to proceed against the colliery owners, and inflict a fine of that character? Was there no power in the hands of the Home Office to bring greater pressure upon colliery owners to conform to the rules, and to inflict heavier penalties than a fine of £5 and costs? In addition to that Report he had received one from the Miners' Federation, who always sent their own people to these inquiries. In their Report they spoke with much greater certainty upon this matter. But in the Home Office inspector's Report there was a strong case for the Department to do something to bring greater pressure to bear upon those who were responsible for sending men into eternity without a moment's notice. In this connection he found himself face to face with the interim Report of the Committee which sat to inquire into the question. In that Report they said with reference to the two explorers who were killed by after-damp in the return airway, that it was possible, or even probable, that if suitable appliances had been at hand and had been resorted to without delay, they might have been rescued, but the organisation of the rescue work was so defective that it was not known that these men were missing until several hours after they had gone into the return airway. In the exploring work two men gave their lives in the attempt to succour their comrades, but no arrangements had been made in any of the mines of this country by which exploring could be made safer. His Majesty had done well in instituting a decorative order, but surely in these days of science men ought not to be called upon to risk their lives in attempting to succour their fellows when with the appliances that now existed rescue work could be conducted under safer conditions. The adoption of rescue appliances was not a new suggestion.

In the interim Report of the Royal Commission he found that during the year 1881, an apparatus was used in connection with the explosion at the Seaham Colliery, Durham, and in connection with the Killingworth disaster in 1882. Since then nothing had been done to perfect the apparatus until interest in the matter was revived by the construction in 1900 of an experimental gallery for testing life-saving apparatus, by Mr. Garforth, at Messrs. Pope and Pearson's Altofts Collieries, in which the state of a mine roadway after an explosion was reproduced on a small scale in order to accustom men to the use of the apparatus in conditions such as were likely to be met with underground. In the event of an explosion, anything which facilitated the rapidity and safety with which the ventilation could be restored and the after-damp removed, must contribute towards the saving of life. Most of the deaths were caused by after-damp, and men were frequently alive for a considerable time after the explosion occurred. He ventured to submit to the Home Secretary that to talk of the invention being too cumbersome for a man to carry on his back when looking through a mine for his fellows was to miss the point altogether. That might be so, but a man with this appliance on his back would be able to make for and put up the doors that had been blown down by the explosion, and so give a current of air in the mines which would assist greatly in the saving of life. The question of the use of such apparatus was among the matters considered by the Royal Commission on Accidents in Mines (1880–1886), and after commenting on the services rendered by the "Fleuss" apparatus on the occasions referred to, they recommended that—

> "Arrangements should be made for the establishment of centres in mining districts, where additional appliances for succour and relief, and also special appliances for exploring purposes, should be maintained in an efficient condition, so as to be ready for use at the shortest notice."

They added that—

> "It is most desirable that facilities should be afforded for the instruction of men in the use of special auxiliary appliances for exploring purposes."

That recommendation had not been given effect to, because the right hon. Gentleman had no object in bringing pressure to bear on colliery owners to realise their responsibility on this question. What other Governments could do the British Government could do, in mercy to these men who risked their lives. In some Continental countries greater attention had been given in recent years to the question of breathing appliances. In Austria their provision had been made compulsory; in Germany, though no regulations had been made by the Government on the subject, a great deal had been done voluntarily, and many of the larger collieries were provided with sets of apparatus. In France, as a result of the Courrières disaster, the question was referred for inquiry to a special commission, and as a result of their Report, a decree was issued in April, 1907, by the Minister of Public Works, making the provision of breathing appliances compulsory in French coal mines. If the French Government thought it desirable to take such steps, our Government ought to exert themselves, and not rest satisfied until these inventions had been perfected, even at the expense of the nation. He was quite aware that a Royal Commission was now sitting, and that they had not gone further than the following—

> "After fully considering the results of experience here and abroad, we are of opinion that the question is ripe for further development in this country, and demands the serious attention of the industry. We have considered whether it would be desirable to make the provision of any of these appliances compulsory, and we have come to the conclusion that sufficient advance has not been made in this country to justify such a course at present."

He thought that showed the attitude taken up by the Royal Commission. He had three esteemed colleagues on that Commission, and he desired to pay full deference to their judgment; but he would say to the Home Secretary that if the coal owners between now and the time when the final Report had been presented had not perfected the whole system of rescue appliances at their own expense, he should bring pressure to bear on the Royal Commission to do something more than consider the question of making compulsory the provision of rescue appliances throughout the United Kingdom. He ventured to submit these proposals from South Wales and Monmouth, where they had sufficient cause to regret the long list of explosions. He suggested that if they did not possess the power they should seek it, to penalise either colliery managers or owners who through their negligence, had been responsible for loss of life in the mines of the country; and, secondly, if it was found in practice that the colliery owners did not respond to this recommendation of the Royal Commission, and voluntarily agree to establish at the collieries these rescue appliances, for use in a mining disaster, something should be done to take the matter out of the category of recommendation, and to make such provision compulsory on all colliery owners in the United Kingdom. Undoubtedly, a large number of colliery owners when they saw these statements would feel their responsibility, and provide the appliances voluntarily; but if some of them proved indifferent to the claims of humanity, he hoped that the Home Secretary would bring the influence of his high office to bear upon them, so that if unhappily an explosion occurred, which God forbid, they would not have to regret the loss of brave rescuers, as in the two cases he had quoted, where the men went into the mine to save their fellows and were sent into eternity, simply because there were not the rescue appliances, and because the conditions at the colliery were such that they were not able to explore.

*Mr. H. J. TENNANT (Berwickshire) said the hon. Member who had last addressed the House complained of too little notice of the date of the debate and of too little time for the study of the Blue-book which reached him only on Thursday. In some respects he was more fortunate than the hon. Member, but in some he was less so. For though he knew earlier of the date of the debate he did not receive a copy of the Blue-book until Monday. The hon. Member for Leicester had referred to the examinations for inspectors of factories and had thrown ridicule on literary subjects being included in the test. His own experience of these matters ranged over a considerable number of years, and he felt convinced that higher education and culture, though not indispensable, were most likely to make the inspector an efficient officer. He could not help thinking that a University education was no drawback to an inspector of factories, but was calculated to make him a more efficient public servant. Before he passed to the main theme of the industrial conditions referred to in the Blue-book, he wanted to say a word about the children in prisons. He was not going to trespass on anything which would entail legislation. His right hon. friend had certain powers under the Youthful Offenders Act for the framing of regulations. The right hon. Gentleman had told them in the speech to which they had listened with so much interest and pleasure, of the numerous circulars and orders which he sent out under his powers, conferred by the Act of 1901. Having these powers to frame regulations under the Youthful Offenders Act, would it not be in the power of his right hon. friend to ask local authorities to treat children under sixteen years, who were under arrest, better than they were being treated at present, and not put them in gaol? Children arrested in London and in some other large towns after the police courts had risen for the day, were, in default of bail, detained in police stations until the following day. If arrested on Saturday, they might be lodged in cells until the following Monday morning. During 1905, thirty seven children under ten years, eighty-six between ten and thirteen, and 293 between thirteen and sixteen years, slept in police stations, prior to admission to the remand homes. In Manchester, however, boys under seventeen and girls under eighteen were never detained at police stations, but lodged after arrest in the Boys and Girls Refuges. It should be remembered that out of a total of 2,518 convictions for non-indictable offences, registered against juveniles under sixteen, during 1904, 554 were for contraventions of police regulations, 1,132 for offences against the Vagrancy Act, while out of 450 cases of stealing, 432 were for stealing fruit, and plants. The present procedure whereby youthful delinquents were brought before the ordinary Courts, and were sentenced by magistrates accustomed to judge hardened offenders, needed reform. Passing from that, he would draw his right hon. friend's attention to the figures in the Blue-book showing the increase in the number of accidents. The increase in the number of fatal accidents had been 5 per cent., and of accidents of all sorts 11·5 per cent. There had been an increase in the number of electrical accidents, though there had been no increase in the number of persons employed. The increase of electrical fatalities was 4·66 per cent. There was an increase of deaths from lead-poisoning, the total of deaths being thirty-three, the percentage increase being 10·30 per cent.; the total number of these cases was 632, or an increase of 40·6. The increase in the number of cases of anthrax was twenty-two, or 4·18 per cent. It was difficult to assign these figures to any one cause, but among the causes which must be taken into account was the looseness of control due to the voluntary system. He would urge the right hon. Gentleman to consent to the abolition of a system under which they had to ask people to do certain things which they had no right to enforce. Whether they considered electrical works or laundries, or bronzing in lithographic works, or dry cleaning, he could prove that the voluntary principle had continued to be a serious source of accidents. The administration of the law was lax, and they wanted in the hands of the Minister power to enforce what was required. For instance, on page 187 of the Annual Report for 1906, Miss Tracey said—

> "Where machinery is used, the dangers of it appeared but little recognised, and in several cases my suggestions as to protection were not carried out for the avowed reason that they were not compulsory."

This had reference to laundries in institutions, but he would not labour the point, because it was one with which every hon. Member was familiar. He would pass to electrical works. He must say how grateful and how glad he was to hear from his right hon. friend the Home Secretary that at last there were in draft certain rules which he proposed to issue to these electrical works. It was a matter in respect of which he had been agitating for a considerable number of years. He wanted to quote three sentences from Mr. G. Scott Ram, who was electrical inspector. Mr. Ram, on page 262 of the annual Report for 1906, said—

> "In my previous Reports I have described a number of the various dangerous conditions of electrical plant which I have come across during the year. I have again a similar selection to bring to your notice."

After describing the death of a man from shock, in which he had received 230 volts through his body to earth, being unable to release his hold of the lamp until the current was switched off, Mr. Ram went on to say—

> "I described and commented upon an exactly similar fatality in my last year's Report. There is little, if anything, new in the nature of the accidents, and any comments which I make upon them must necessarily be in the nature of repetition of the remarks I have made in former Reports."

He noticed that Mr. Scott Ram made that kind of apology, and it was with great pleasure that he heard that the right hon. Gentleman was going to frame some new regulations. Again, Mr. Scott Ram said—

> "This switchboard was apparently satisfactory so far as the working platform was concerned, but the various passage ways in connection with it were a series of death traps. . . . . . three bare and unprotected bus-bars at 6,000 volts. The floor of this passage-way was of iron, and the clear width was about 18 inches. . . . . . No means of access was, however, provided for getting to these plug switches other than along the passage-way described. Even assuming that the attendant should safely reach the plug switches there was no room for him to work them, ... there was exposed live metal within 3 or 4 inches of the handles, and the bus-bars were, of course, close to; (the combined arrangement being such as to offer a great and totally unwarrantable risk in operation.")

He read that quotation because one of the recommendations made by the Departmental Committee appointed ten years ago was that passages and gangways should be covered with an insulating mat and kept in an efficient state of insulation. Mr. Ram described another case—

> "An undesirable feature, not unfrequently met with, was also present here, namely, apparatus, requiring occasional handling, fixed on the wall of the other side of the passage-way. In this case some of it was arranged in a particularly dangerous manner. Some high-pressure switch fuses for instrument transformers were fixed on the back wall at 6 feet from the iron floor. In order to handle them a man would have to stand with his back towards the live terminals of the main portion of the switch-board, one of which was so placed that he would almost certainly touch it with the back of his head when handling the switch fuses. It is difficult to account for the apparently reckless want of thought in cases such as this, where the danger is so obvious and of such serious kind, *i.e.*, sudden death to the unwary attendant."

Another of the same Committee's recommendations was that in all switchboards the main switches should be insulated or arranged in such a way as would render it impossible for any person to touch them. He gave those two illustrations to show how necessary it was that this danger, which had been the cause of an increased number of deaths, should be placed under more strict regulations. He noticed that Miss Deane and Miss Slocock had made a special report on bronzing in which they said—

> "We have seldom found the voluntary Special Rules satisfactorily carried out."
>
> "We have found bronze dust lying thickly all over and around the machine, and powdering the hands, faces, hair, and clothes of the workers."

Then they described a new bronzing machine which they said was expensive, but the cost would be quickly repaid, not only in the bronze which would be saved, but in time and greater efficiency in the work and the safety of the workers. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would consent to pass special regulations for bronzing in lithographic factories, and those people who were good enough to provide themselves with this expensive bronzing machine need not necessarily comply with the more stringent regulations. In Germany they had special rules dealing with this trade, and he would remind the right hon. Gentleman that Inspectors Miss Deane and Miss Slocock reported upon this point that they—

> "look upon it as a serious feature in conditions of industry, requiring more attention than has been given to it."

With regard to dry cleaning there was a circular in the Report in which his right hon. friend expressed some pious opinions which were admirable, but they were only pious opinions and nothing else, and they were expressed by his Committee which sat in 1896. All sorts of recommendations were made that the women and girls should wash their hands and be provided with wet sand and other materials for putting out fires, because there was great danger of the benzine igniting. The Memorandum went on to say—

> "It is desirable that women and young persons should be periodically examined by the Certifying Surgeon."

Then, if it was desirable, why, in the name of common sense, was it not made obligatory? That brought him to the Report of the Under-Secretary's Committee on industrial diseases to be scheduled for the Compensation Act, an interesting, and a valuable contribution to the industrial literature of that House. But there were one or two important omissions in that report. One of them had been dealt with by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean, and the other was the dangers incurred by naphtha. Last winter, in replying to the speech of the hon. Member for West Ham, the Under-Secretary rather poohpoohed the idea that there was any danger from naphtha. He wanted to deal with this question because Professor Glaister brought two cases of death from naphtha before the Committee. He would like to call attention to Miss Paterson's report in 1899, in which she said—

> "I visited a number of them (workers in naphtha) in their homes and also the doctors near two large factories employing a large number of girls, and learned that a reduced state of health is looked on as the usual result of such employment."

Later on in 1902 Miss Paterson reported—

> "I have had interviews with a number of workers, and have heard from them much of the varying symptons of anæmia, shortness of breath, palpitation, headache, with some pain and functional disturbances."

Why had naphtha been rejected by his right hon. friend? He had stated that when a man died from naphtha in the cases quoted it was considered to be an accident, and in other cases where the girls had suffered he understood that the Committee's position was that there was no definite illness and nothing which could be called chronic, which was specifically attributable to this substance. There was another case in the Glasgow Western Infirmary under the care of Dr. Finlayson, which was reported in the *British Medical Journal*—

> "At that time he was unconscious and lay breathing heavily, . . . he afterwards became very restless and almost maniacal, he tried to get out of bed, saying that he was late for his work. He vomited several ounces of greenish fluid. . . . For the most part the patient continued exceedingly restless, with diarrhœa and vomiting at intervals."
>
> "The necropsy, made by Professor Muir, showed that the lower portions of both lungs were consolidated, of a reddish grey colour, and at parts coated with a thin film of fibrin. In the upper part of the left lung there were a number of small ragged cavities where the lung tissue was beginning to break down; both lungs showed signs of an acute bronchitis."

Any material used which was capable of producing such results as those ought certainly to be scheduled as dangerous. On this matter he wished for a moment to analyse the position of the Committee. If it was true that the man died from naphtha poisoning, and that it was an accident, let them compare it with anthrax. It hadbeen held in a Court of law that anthrax poisoning was an accident, yet anthrax was scheduled in the Workmen's Compensation Act. There was all the more reason why they should schedule naphtha, whose evil effects had never been held by a Court to be an accident. The effects which were produced in workers connected with the naphtha trade should surely make the trade rank as a "dangerous trade" in which compensation should be given. He begged his right hon. friend to consider this case. If he did so in the way suggested he would earn the gratitude of a very large and increasing number of workers using this substance. Workers in naphtha were denied special protection; for the want of it they got ill, and were then denied compensation.

*MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland) said the reasons which had been urged by the hon. Member for Leicester against the present method of appointing factory inspectors applied equally to the method of appointing mining inspectors. During the past year he had asked the Home Secretary several Questions on this subject. From a Return with which he had been supplied he found that in regard to the mining inspectors there had been four separate examinations. Two applicants were exempted from examination, and he wanted to know why they were exempted. He found also that out of six cases where there were examinations only one nomination was made. He wanted to know how many applicants there were. There were fifteen separate examinations in respect of assistant-inspectors, but out of six cases there was only one nomination. Two applicants were exempted from examination. One man had acted as assistant inspector twenty-two weeks before he sat for examination. In his own district there were men who held the necessary certificate, and had sent in applications with the view to becoming colliery inspectors, but none of them had been allowed to sit for examination. He would like to get an explanation why they were not examined. He was against the system of selection and nomination. He contended that more efficient inspectors would be obtained if their qualifications had previously been ascertained by examination. Many men who had done practical work in the mines were prevented by the present system from obtaining positions as mining inspectors. He called attention to the terms of the contracts under which the clothing for prison warders was made, and stated that a complaint had been made that the regulations required in regard to work for other Government Departments were not complied with in the case of the Home Office. In the case of the Post Office the contractor undertook that all garments should be made in his own factory, and that no work should be done at the houses of the workpeople. Any infringement of that condition, if proved to the satisfaction of the Postmaster-General, rendered the contractor liable to a penalty not exceeding £100 for each offence. The clause in the contracts for work done for the Home Office was not, in his judgment, so satisfactory, and he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would introduce into future contracts a clause similar to that in the Post Office contracts for clothing. If the right hon. Gentleman could do so, he would remove much friction which existed at present, and they would be in a position of knowing that there was no danger from infectious disease and unfair conditions of labour.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.) said he desired to call attention to a matter which he hoped would receive the sympathetic consideration of the Home Secretary, namely, the question of the police charges levied on the cab industry in London. He did not think many hon. Members were aware of what these charges were, nor could they know that the industry at the present time was not in such a flourishing condition as it was some years ago when the charges were first instituted. Since those days there had been introduced the competition of the "tubes," motor cabs, and motor omnibuses. These new modes of travelling had had a prejudicial effect on the cab industry, and yet the charges to which he was referring remained the same as before. The driver's licence cost 5s., the plate licence £2, and in addition there was the Inland Revenue wheel tax of 15s., making £3. The money was applied to payment of an inspecting staff; but, inasmuch as inspection was as much, if not more, in the interest of the public as in that of the cab drivers, it would be only fair that the public should contribute a share. In 1905 the revenue from cabs and omnibuses, including motor omnibuses and cabs, was £40,000, and the expenditure £39,000. He appealed on the ground of common fairness on behalf of horse-drawn cabs, which were now subjected to keen competition, for a considerable reduction in the charges.

*MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe) said the speech of the right hon. Gentleman was one of the most encouraging they had had on the Home Office Vote since he had been in the House, and they were very grateful for the work he had done. The right hon. Gentleman had referred to the inquiries which were going on, and they looked forward to his having opportunities of dealing with the matters which were being inquired into. He wished to refer to the inquiry with regard to the humidity in the cotton cloth factories. The question had been brought before the right hon. Gentleman's notice, and he wished to express his extreme pleasure that he had responded to their requests in such a speedy manner. They were fully confident of their case, and if the employers, when they were brought together, could not agree, they would have to persist in it. It was also highly gratifying to know that the staff had been increased, and one remark by the right hon. Gentleman led them to believe that there was room for still greater increase. The right hon. Gentleman said he had not consulted the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but in this case there would not, he imagined, be much difficulty, because the Chancellor of the Exchequer had been in the position of Home Secretary, and no doubt had full knowledge of the requirements of that department. This, coupled with the earnestness with which he knew the right hon. Gentleman would make his requests, should be sufficient to get for them a grant which would enable a big increase to be made in the staff. The annual Report proved that the Inspectors required more help; their districts were too large, and they had too many factories and workshops to attend to. Proper inspection could not be attained unless there was some further increase. It was for that reason that in the cotton district they had asked for outside assistance in the matter of time cribbing. They felt that the employers were defying the inspectors and that the staff could not meet the urgency of the case. Hon. Members might not understand what time cribbing was. Some of the people in the cotton mills were paid by the piece and some by the day. The engine was started some few minutes before the time and was kept running some minutes after the time, and all this extra work was put in in many cases without pay. From the point of view of physique alone, this time cribbing ought to be stopped. Of course, so far as individual members were concerned, the Operatives Associations could not be responsible, but they discouraged the practice of working during the meal hour in every possible way. There might be cases where the operatives were somewhat to blame, but the employer was solely responsible for the engine being started and stopped at the proper time. So far as that was concerned, no stones could be thrown at the operatives. The inspector for the South-West Division reported as follows on the question—

> "Very little that is new can be said on the subject which in its generally accepted term refers solely to cotton mills and to their practice of running the engine and machinery a few minutes both before and after the legal periods. For this the employers alone can of course be held responsible, though up to now at any rate many of the employed, being on piecework, had not been averse to the practice, and where it had been checked complaints had been heard of the consequent reduction in money earned. There are signs, however, now that the more recent agitation carried on by the Operatives Associations will have the effect of leaving those dishonest employers who continue to crib time without any sympathisers."

They were glad to notice that from the Superintendent Inspector in their district. He would like to call the attention of the right hon. gentleman to p. 136 of the Report, where there was a reference by the Inspector. He said—

> "Mr. Lewis (Manchester), Mr. Crabtree (Oldham), and Mr. Clark (Bolton) each write strongly on the prevalence of this offence in their districts, whilst Mr. Taylor (Blackburn), and Mr. Rogers (C.C.F.) report more favourably on theirs."

The Superintendent Inspector therefore went out of his way to give two quotations from the inspectors who reported favourably, whilst he did not give a single sentence of the three men who condemned the practice seriously. He asked whether there ought not to be as much attention called to the condemnation of the practice as to those cases where it was said there had been an improvement, and whether the Chief Inspector should not at least do what he could in his report to discourage it by giving prominence to the condemnation of it. Then there was another point with regard to the number of prosecutions. There were eight districts, affecting thousands upon thousands of operatives, millions of spindles and hundreds of thousands of looms, but there had been only 886 cases reported, and the fines and costs totalled only £1,149, an average of 16s. 4d. in fines and 9s. 7d. in costs. Those who knew the cotton mills in the last few years knew that these fines could be made up in a day by running excessive time. It was absolutely nothing to a man who had thousands of spindles and looms running overtime for three hours a week to be fined a paltry sum of 16s. 4d. in each case. So far as fines were concerned, the question would have to be dealt with in a more severe manner. If in a mill there were 150 operatives being employed illegally cases should be brought in regard to them all, and not merely in regard to twenty, and if the magistrates exercised any leniency it should be in regard to the whole number and not merely with regard to a half dozen or so. They had to thank the right hon. Gentleman for having obtained the assistance of the police through the watch committees in checking time cribbing. The method they suggested and which the right hon. Gentleman had accepted was that the police, who numbered roughly 1 to 1,000 of population, should, if they found on their rounds a mill going before or after the proper time, report the matter to the inspectors. Any policeman in Lancashire could tell without going into the mill whether a mill was running for production or merely for trying purposes. The Home Secretary had asked as many watch committees as would to adopt this policy, but they thought he might move a little further in the matter and extend his inquiries. There were a number of watch committees where there were no borough police, and they, as well as the watch committees where there were borough police and the county authority at Preston, should receive the Home Office circulars. They had to complain that in this connection they did not think the inspectors were taking kindly to the police coming into the business. They had this from people who were in the towns and who had to make reports. He would give a case which occurred within the last two month. In April of this year the police saw and heard the machinery full at work at 5.55 in Royal Mills, Oldham. The assumption was that the mill had been running some minutes then. Information was sent to the inspector, but he suggested that it would be better if he tried to catch them himself. It was a firm which was known to be guilty of the practice, and he suggested that it would be better if he went and saw what he could do on his own. He went and caught them, but he only took out twenty-six summonses, though he might have taken at least eighty. The management were very obstinate, and denied it. They said it was an odd case which the inspector had happened to come across. This was the usual excuse of employers who did all they could to prevent inspectors doing their work efficiently. There was in a mill what was called a Moss crop indicator, and this machine indicated the correct time. Reports were made frequently that the mill was running overtime, and both the inspector and the police had discovered it, but still the indicator only gave the correct time. The secret was found out afterwards and before the case was tried, but still the inspector did not proceed. It was found that the indicator would only indicate at sixty strokes a minute of the engine, and in order to deceive the inspector the engine was run at fifty-five strokes a minute till the correct time. Surely in such a case the inspector ought to have been as severe as possible, and to have taken more than twenty-six cases. The result was that fines of 20s. and costs in ten cases were inflicted, the costs only being required to be paid in the others. What was the language of the inspector? He said he thought the firm ought to be more careful because they knew of the fact as to the working of overtime. He said he did not want to be hard with them, but he wanted it to be known that the Factory Act must be carried out. Coming to the case of the Clough Mills, Shaw, the House would find it reported that the inspector only brought thirteen cases where he could have brought eighty. While these proceedings were going on a notice was found posted up behind a door to the effect that if certain classes of workpeople left the mills before the engine stopped they would be discharged without notice. It was well known that this firm had been caught by the inspector and prosecuted, and yet the notice was put up. The chairman of the bench stated that he thought the inspector had dealt very leniently with defendants by bringing only thirteen summonses. He thought it was very lenient, as they had attempted to hoodwink the inspector, and the firm had been brought before the Court several times. His correspondent said he must frankly confess that he was of opinion that the inspectors were against the police being called upon to have anything to do with this time-cribbing business because they believed it might take some of the authority from their hands. He could truthfully say on the most reliable information that already in Oldham the sanction given to the police to assist in the work of detecting time-cribbing had materially tended to make their limited companies more honest in loyally carrying out the Factory Acts, as in the space of time in which the police had been employed they had had considerably less complaints than formerly. He thought the police should be brought in to assist the inspectors. There was a machine for checking the action of the engines, and he thought the employers had had sufficient time given to them to improve this state of things. He thanked the Home Secretary for his promise, and on their part they would give him all the encouragement they could in their several districts.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL, Yorkshire, Cleveland), replying to some of the points advanced during the debate, said that his right hon. friend entirely agreed with the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken as to the evils of time-cribbing. It was certainly a mean action on the part of employers to steal the workmen's time, as was being done notoriously in many mills in Lancashire. A difficulty in the matter was that of securing cumulative fines. In one case, for instance, where twenty-six charges were made against a firm the magistrates imposed fines in respect of only ten. The factory inspectors had now definite instructions no longer to take only one or two cases but to take out a number of summonses in every case. As to the provision of an automatic indicator of the running of the engines, that was a matter for legislation. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean had raised three questions—the questions of lead, fruit preserving, and fish curing. On all these points the Home Office had within the past twelve months taken action. It was no doubt lamentable that the figures in lead poisoning again showed an upward tendency. Every case meant a terrible amount of human suffering, and it was but a poor consolation to say that compensation would be paid. The number of cases last year was 632, against 592, a considerable increase; but it should be noted that in 1899 the number was 1,258, and in the year after that 1,058, so that they had, at any rate, the consolation of knowing that the average number had been reduced by something like 50 per cent. since that time. Although the reduced figures might give some satisfaction, they in no sense afforded any reason for the relaxation of efforts to stamp out industrial diseases. The condition of things could not be described as satisfactory until they had been reduced to an absolute minimum. The Home Office had endeavoured during last year to cope in various ways with this question. They had made regulations for the safety of workers in the trade of grinding paints and colours. Regulations were in draft dealing with the processes of tinning hardware. The whole china and earthenware trade regulations were about to be overhauled, and it was hoped they would effect a large reduction in the cases of lead poisoning. The draft of a new Order dealing with the fruit-preserving industry had been published. Should the new Order be criticised on the ground that it did not go far enough in regard to the hours of labour, it should be remembered that in the case of the fruit-preserving and fish-curing industries the powers of the Department were limited by the form in which statutory exemptions were extended to these industries, and that though the Secretary of State might impose conditions to qualify those exemptions he could not make conditions which nullified them. The fish-curing industry was being made the subject of a special inquiry with a view to deciding as to the best mode of revising the regulations. The inquiry would specially include the question of sanitation, which was one of great gravity. The chief inspector of factories would personally visit a number of these fish-curing factories before long, and when he reported, the Home Office hoped to have a scheme to deal with the whole situation. The medical officers' reports referred to by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean were exceedingly voluminous, and would need condensation to make them proper for publication, but such portions of them as could properly be published would, he hoped, be published with the Report of the inquiry. The Departmental Committee on Compensation for Industrial Diseases regretted that they could not recommend the scheduling of fibrosis of the lungs, although it was a disease which could be definitely traced to certain industries. He recognised from the beginning that the scheduling of this disease would meet with grave objection, not only from the employers, but also in the interests of the employed. The initial stages of the disease usually extended over several years, and in the early period it was indistinguishable from ordinary cough or bronchitis, and the result of scheduling it would be prejudicial to workmen, who might lose their employment on mere suspicion that they were developing the disease, the employers finding that they would be unable to insure them. This view was supported by the witness who attended on behalf of the Sheffield grinders, who urged them not to schedule the disease. Dr. Haldane took the same view, and said that to schedule the disease would be disastrous to the tin miners of Cornwall. Dr. Oliver, one of the greatest authorities on dangerous trades, took the same line, and said that on the whole it was not to the advantage of the workmen that this disease should be scheduled. With regard to the opinion of the hon. Member for Berwickshire that they ought to have scheduled poisoning by naphtha, on the ground that it was clearly an industrial disease, if the Committe had thought it was an industrial disease and that it incapacitated the worker from his work they would have scheduled it, but they took a good deal of evidence and had come unanimously to the conclusion, after visiting a number of india-rubber factories where the naphtha poisoning was alleged to take place, that there was no industrial disease due to naphtha. The inference they had drawn from the medical evidenec he had quoted was that the poisoning attributed to the naphtha was due to carbon bisulphide.

*MR. H. J. TENNANT said that in cases of lead poisoning they had cases of chronic illness, and he himself had produced cases of almost exactly similar chronic illness from naphtha poisoning.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL said they could not find it. They took evidence, and Dr. Oliver said in reference to the question of naphtha poisoning in india-rubber works that, while there might be some inconvenience caused to some of the workers, there was no incapacity lasting for the week that was necessary to qualify for compensation, due to this cause. There was very much more evidence to the same effect. He had dealt with it at some length because it was an important point, and if there was a naphtha disease, they would be deservedly open to censure if it were not scheduled under the Act; and if it could be shown that the disease existed, he had no doubt that the right hon Gentleman would add it to the schedule. The other points which had been mentioned would be carefully noted by the Department. As to accidents due to electricity, regulations were now being made which had taken a long time to prepare. The hon. Member for Leicester had raised two points—one a large one and the other a small one. The small one had reference to the omission of mileage statistics from the factory inspector's report. These had been omitted because they could draw no conclusion whatever from them. If the figures were small, it might be stated that thev showed that the districts were well organised. If they were large, they might be held to prove how hard was the work of the inspectors, and the large amount of inspection they did. In 1905 the mileage was 944,000 miles; in 1906 the figures showed a reduction to 935,000 miles—a very small decrease. The number of visits paid—which was of much more importance—in the course of the year showed an increase from 372,000 to 382,000. The rest of the hon. Member for Leicester's speech was devoted to the point that the inspector's assistants had not got sufficiently large functions, and were not given the work to which their qualifications entitled them. As far as he understood the hon. Member, he advocated that the two branches of the service should be amalgamated more or less, and that the same functions should be given to all classes of factory inspectors. But he would point out that the work of factory inspection was very various and required various qualifications. The inspectors had to investigate difficult questions in safeguarding complicated machinery; they had to administer elaborate and detailed codes of special safety rules; they had to conduct cases in Court and examine and cross-examine witnesses; they had to write full reports on the condition of the various industries with which they had to deal, and they had to deal with scientific questions of humidity, temperature, and so forth. There was also a great deal of much simpler work, such as the inspection of workshops and other matters. It was held by the Home Office that it was not desirable to employ men at comparatively high salaries and of a high standard of education to do the simpler work of inspecting workshops and other places, while a class of men could be obtained with economy to the State at a lower salary—men of lower educational qualifications, but who could do this simpler work. The latter, however, would not be so well qualified to take cases into Court or deal with the higher branches of inspection. There were 140,000 workshops which urgently needed inspection, and if they took the inspectors' assistants from that work someone else would have to replace them, and they would have to get the more highly paid and more highly educated inspectors to do the simpler work. It might be asked why did not a non-commissioned officer do the work of a commissioned officer, or a second division clerk in the Civil Service the work of a first division clerk. The assistant-inspectors were able men, but in the view of the Department the work of the higher grade was more suited to the men who were members of that higher grade. He much regretted to hear the hon. Member deride the educational standard by scoffing at questions on Shakespeare and examinations of that kind, and he apparently held the view that the qualification for these inspectorships should be technical and not educational.

*MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD: My contention was that education should be technical and scientific, and not literary.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: The hon. Member might say the same thing about Army examinations in subjects which have nothing to do with warfare.

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD: Your officers show the result.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL said the same ridicule might be cast on the examination papers for entrance into the Home Civil Service or the Indian Civil Service. The questions asked often had little direct relation to the work which the successful candidates would be required to perform. The examinations of Civil servants in various subjects was to ascertain that the candidates were men of a high educational standard. He should have thought that the hon. Member himself, who in his own life showed the immense importance he attached to wide culture, would be the last to lower the educational standard of any branch of the Civil Service. In nominating for examinations they endeavoured to obtain, as a rule, a combination of educational and technical qualifications. In conclusion, he would just deal with two or three other points which had been raised by hon. Members. The hon. Member for Sunderland had complained that all the persons who applied for posts as inspectors of mines were not allowed to attend the certificate examinations. He did not think there was a hall large enough to hold all the candidates for inspectorships at one time. It would appear, he often thought, that the constituents of hon. Members were divided into two classes—those who wanted to be factory inspectors and those wanted to be mine inspectors. It would be ridiculous to assemble all the scores of hundreds of candidates for mine inspectorships when perhaps there were only one or two vacancies to fill. The rule was to nominate three or four of the candidates with the highest qualifications, when a vacancy was to be filled. In his own view it was not desirable to have merely qualifying examinations, and there ought to be competitive examinations for these posts. The question had also been raised as to the form of contract for clothing. He would take care that it was carefully looked into to see if it was possible in any way to improve it. The hon. Member for Marylebone had raised the question as to the charges imposed by the Home Office on omnibuses and hackney cabs. He would be only too glad to reduce, even to abolish, many of those charges, but it was purely a question of finance and of ways and means. When the Select Committee not long ago reported on the subject they recommended the abolition of the charge of £2, his right hon. friend carefully considered the question, but the condition of the Police Fund was such that it was already trembling on the verge of a deficit. It was purely a matter of balancing accounts, and the Police Fund could not afford to lose the amount which now went to the public expenses of the police in respect of cabs and omnibuses. He was exceedingly grateful to the Committee for their appreciation of the work done by the Department during the last twelve months, and he could assure the Committee that their activity in relation to the very important matters entrusted to their charge would continue.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS (Kent, St. Augustine's) said he wished to express his hearty appreciation of the action of His Majesty in regard to the granting of medals for life-saving in mines. He thought it only right that some reward should be given to encourage that kind of gallantry. He noticed that the Home Secretary had stated that he intended shortly to introduce a measure dealing with the eight-hours question. Of course, he could not deal with that subject now, but he took it that the right hon. Gentleman was only going to introduce it this session in order that it might be proceeded with at a later date. With regard to the Report, he was sure they all regretted to see an increase in the number of accidents. He did not know whether the Home Secretary had formed any opinion as to whether that was due to the increased tendency to adopt mechanical power or to the fact that accidents were more rapidly and regularly reported than in the past. It was quite possible that the Workmen's Compensation Act had something to do with the result. He regretted the increase, and felt certain that the Home Office would do all they could to render accidents as few as possible in the future. He noticed from the Factory Report that there had also been an increase in the number of industrial diseases. He should not have mentioned the subject but for the remarks of the hon. Member for Berwickshire, who seemed to think that the pains and penalties which would accrue in consequence of the Compensation Act would make the employers more careful. He had observed in other occupations that if people knew they were insured they were not always so careful as they otherwise would be. [Cries of "No."] He desired like other hon. Members that there should be as few accidents as possible, and that every precaution should be taken by the Home Office to reduce the number. He would also like to know when the Home Office expected to receive the report of the Commission on the Metropolitan Police. That Commission had been sitting a very long time, and such a splendid body of men ought not to be kept in suspense. The right hon. Gentleman had paid a thoroughly well-deserved compliment to the able and most efficient and hard-working officials of the Department over which he presided. He also wished to offer his congratulations, because he was perfectly certain that no Department last year had harder work to perform than the Home Office. The number of inquiries taking place there, and the amount of legislation undertaken by that office, had thrown a great amount of work upon the officials, and he congratulated them upon the way they had got through the work and the excellence of the work they had done. He trusted that this year they would not have an autumn session, because, quite apart from the fatigue and inconvenience to hon. Members, his sympathies were with those officials in the Government Departments who would have an extra amount of work thrown upon them in addition to the ordinary administration of their office. It was quite impossible for a Minister properly to administer his Department if he had to be in the House of Commons for about ten months in the year. With regard to the Berne Conference, the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean said that he had not dealt with that subject because it had been fully dealt with in the House of Lords. The debate in the other Chamber was, however, an exceedingly short one, because their Lordships were waiting to take up a bigger subject. One of the subjects considered at that Conference was the night work of women. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean thought that when the first Conference took place the Home Office were very much to blame for not giving a freer hand to their representatives. The Under-Secretary found at the second Conference that upon this subject it was desirable they should move cautiously. He should like to know whether any arrangement was come to at the second Conference with regard to the prohibition of white phosphorus and whether Japan had come into the Conference or not. They must have unanimity in the matter or they would have to leave it alone. He had always found that if they prohibited the use of white phosphorus in this country, they would inflict a great hardship upon manufacturers unless at the same time they prohibited its importation from abroad. He thought they were very wise not to proceed too rapidly in the matter. In the past they had succeeded in this country in dealing with this question by strict regulations as to ventilation, cleanliness, and the separation of the dangerous processes, and by an examination from time to time of the workers, and in that way they had practically succeeded in stamping out the disease. He thought that by carefully carrying out good regulations they would be able to secure the end which they all desired without prohibiting the use of white phosphorus. With regard to the night labour of women he was glad to notice that some arrangement had been arrived at. In reference to the question of laundries he would like to know whether the convent laundries were accepting voluntary inspection. He did not for a moment think that voluntary inspection was equal to compulsory inspection, but he was anxious to see some better system adopted. He took a great interest in this matter because when he was at the Home Office they were very anxious to try the voluntary system of inspection pending fresh legislation, and he should like to know whether those religious and conventual houses where laundry work was carried on had submitted to any inspection and whether they were still willing to receive that inspection voluntarily. With regard to the administration of the Aliens Act he noticed that the statistics were furnished in an entirely different form, and were very much clearer. They could not, however, compare them with former years because they were drawn up on different lines from those issued by the Board of Trade in the old days. Mr. Haldane-Porter's first Report showed that very great care had been taken in the compilation of these statistics, and he thought this would be the first of many Reports which would justify the appointment of so able an official. By the alteration which had been made in the number they had admitted many undesirables. He wished to refer to the question of the expulsion of aliens under Section 3, which dealt with persons convicted of offences for which a man was liable to be sentenced to imprisonment without the option of a fine. No less than 448 recommendations were received by the Home Office, and some of those were still undergoing terms of imprisonment. Over 310 cases came up for the Home Secretary's decision, and expulsion orders in those cases had been issued. He was glad to notice that the operation of the Act was having some effect in reducing the alien prison population, and he hoped the Returns would show that in future years they would have a very small number of criminal aliens in the home prisons. The figures were very encouraging this year, but he had hopes that they would see a still further reduction in future years. There was one other question he would like to put to the Home Secretary, which, owing to lack of time the other night when the Home Office Vote was discussed, he was unable to ask. His question related to the Kynoch case. He wished to know in the first place what was the position of the Home Office, the War Office, and the Admiralty in the matter, and, in the second place, whether the 3,000 tons of cordite supplied by Messrs. Kynoch to the Army and Navy——

And, it being a quarter-past Eight of the clock, and there being Private

Business set down by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceed- was postponed without Question put.

MIDLAND RAILWAY BILL [LORDS] (BY ORDER).

Order for the Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

*MR. MORTON (Sutherland) said the time had more than arrived when sleeping accommodation should be provided for third-class passengers by all the railway companies where it was provided for first-class passengers. He was satisfied from personal observation that it would be quite possible to construct third-class sleeping carriages for the long journeys to the north in such a manner as to occupy only about half of the space now given to first-class passengers. If that could be done, the companies had no reason to complain of the request now being made, because such an arrangement would harmonise with the general conditions on which fares were fixed, the first-class fares being generally double the third-class fares. He represented a part of Scotland which was some 700 or 800 miles from London, and he was continually receiving complaints, especially from people who had to travel for business purposes,in regard to the want of third-class sleeping accommodation. He had spoken to railway managers and others on this subject, and the reply was, "Oh, these sleeping carriages, even the the first class, do not pay us." He was aware that the first-class passenger traffic, except the suburban traffic, did not pay, but it took the railway companies fifty years to find out that the first-class passengers were travelling at the expense of the third-class passengers. Experience had shown that the better the third-class passengers were treated the more traffic the railway companies had. He did not wish that Railway Bills should be thrown out because the companies did not provide third-class sleeping accommodation, but he hoped the companies would take this matter into serious consideration. He acknowledged that some assistance had already been given by the Board of Trade, and he would be pleased if they would take some stronger step to compel the companies to do what was right to all classes. The railway companies should remember that the third-class passengers formed the bulk of the people who travelled, and that it was from them the profits were received. The Midland Company had in the past been in advance of other companies in introducing reforms, and he hoped that they would show a good example in this matter.

*MR. SMEATON (Stirlingshire) urged that the Board of Trade should put pressure on the railway companies to provide third-class sleeping carriages. The Department, in tendering advice to the railway companies, might suggest that they should consult the hon. Member for Sutherlandshire who had made the subject of third-class sleeping accommodation a special study; in fact although it would be a loss to this House, he would advise the companies to engage the hon. Member as their professional adviser in the construction of the accommodation required; as he seemed to have a patent for the purpose in his pocket.

MR. SEDDON (Lancashire, Newton) said that if the railway companies did not soon yield on this point their Bills would be opposed. He thought the railway companies had treated the third-class passengers very unfairly. They should have considered the subject more sympathetically than they had done. He was convinced that the the railway companies would be studying their own interest if they provided third-class sleeping carriages. The present conditions were particularly hard upon women and children who travelled at night. At stopping places the doors were opened and the draught which came in could not be in the interest of the health of the travellers.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. KEARLEY, Devonport) said the Board of Trade always endeavoured to induce the railway companies to supply third-class sleeping accommodation, and personally he believed they would not find it a losing matter. Perhaps his hon. friend the

Member for Sutherland would introduce a Bill and take the sense of the House on the subject.

*MR. MORTON: I have tried for years to get a place for a Bill in the ballot and have always failed.

*MR. KEARLEY: I hope my hon. friend will persevere.

*MR. MORTON: That is what I am doing.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

*MR. BRUNNER (Lancashire, Leigh) moved that it be an instruction to the Committee to omit Clause 30 and any other references to the abandonment of a portion of the Cromford Canal. He said there was an important question of principle involved in Clause 30. The Midland Railway Company proposed to obtain statutory power to close Butterley Tunnel and to isolate eight and a quarter miles of Cromford Canal, together with a large reservoir. The canal was in Derbyshire, and if this part of it were isolated a certain number of factories, quarries, and mines would be cut off from the canal system of the country. It was most important also to bear in mind that the water from the Butterley reservoir would be cut off from the canals which joined lower down. The railway company proposed to construct certain conduits for the water. The Midland Railway Company acquired the Cromford Canal in 1870 by buying up the Matlock Railway Company, who were the owners of the canal, and in so doing they undertook a statutory obligation to keep the canal in repair. The tunnel had subsided by reason of coal-mining operations underneath. The Midland Railway Company had power to buy the coal, and that power had been partly but not fully exercised. The Board of Trade sent down an inspector recently to report on the state of the canal, and also whether the traffic conditions justified the closing of the tunnel. He reported that the canal was not in a very good condition. The report also stated that the traffic conditions were such as to justify the company in endeavouring to get statutory power to close the canal. He was sorry the terms of reference did not permit the inspector to inquire into the question how that state of things had come about. He would tell the House why the traffic had so much diminished. He asserted that the railway company had killed the traffic on the canal The tunnel was closed from 1889 to 1893, and it was also closed from 1900. It was perfectly obvious that no one would erect factories, or wharves, or build boats to be put on a canal where the conditions were so risky. Neither had the railway company adopted modern methods for the working of the canal. The figures in the Board of Trade inspector's report showed how the traffic on the canal had been killed since it came into possession of the railway company. For each of the three years previous to 1870 the average tonnage was 158,000 tons, while for the last three years it was only 43,000 tons. The House would want to know why the railway company had been permitted to keep the tunnel closed since 1900. It would be obvious to the House that the small trader could not fight the great railway companies, and further, the railway company had carried at low rates for the traders and done carting free. He had read the Bill and he did not see any proposal to continue to cart the traders' goods free. The question of the water was a most important one. The railway company had no property in the water of the canal; the water used to flow through the tunnel, and it was vital to the existence of the Erewash and Nottingham Canals which joined it at the east. It was proposed by the Bill to construct conduits, but he was informed by the people who wanted the water that the proposal was utterly inadequate. The Railway Company in addition used for their own purposes and sold the water which ought to go down the canal. The railway company simply first killed the traffic and then neglected the ordinary repairs, so that the condition went from bad to worse; they were very astute in the matter. He should have done all this if he had been the manager of the railway company, but he did not think the House ought to back him up in his conduct. Was the railway company to be permitted to allow this tunnel to remain in its present condition simply because it would cost a lot of money to put it right? The company, having bought the Matlock Railway and the Cromford Canal, ought not to be allowed to take all the profit out of the railway without having any of the liabilities with regard to the canal. There was another important consideration. At the present time there was a Royal Commission sitting on the question of the canals and waterways of the country, and in view of that fact he thought the conduct of the company was little short of impudent. The canal was not important in itself, but it was an important feeder, and reached a part of the country that was well situated for constructing reservoirs. If it were closed important gathering grounds for water would be cut off. For these reasons he hoped the House would pass the instruction which stood in his name, and which he begged to move.

*MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) seconded. He said it was impossible to consider the general question of waterways without being convinced that for some cause or other water traffic and canal business had been skilfully encouraged abroad and skilfully and scientifically discouraged and almost killed here. There was no secret about the cause and history of it. Ostensibly with the idea of running canal barges as adjuncts to trucks on railways, but really with the intention of eventually closing canals and removing from railway trucks the competition of canal barges, canals had been acquired by railway companies in a most daring manner. Railway companies in the past had come before the country and assented to the upkeep of the canals, and in this case the bargain was that the railway company should be allowed to buy the length of private railway and the canal if they kept the canal and the works of the canal in good working order and condition. They were to preserve the supply of water and keep the canal open to all traffic and promote the proper interests of traffic along the canal, which was the central link in the canal system of the country. Owing to the stoppage in the tunnel, the coal traffic and the traffic of other canals had been adversely affected. The company thus, in allowing their own property to be damaged, had seriously damaged other people. He was there on behalf of the Nottingham Corporation to second the Motion that it should be an instruction to the Committee to delete from the Bill the clause dealing with the Cromford Canal. The Midland Railway Company were putting up a mere pretext to abandon it. The opponents did not want to damage the prospects of this Bill, but he trusted that that House would wait until they had the report of the Royal Commission on Canals and Waterways before passing this clause, so that they could see whether that body was in favour of keeping open or closing the canal. If that course were adopted the Midland Railway Company could come to the House with a Bill later to insert in their statutes this clause which it was now proposed to delete.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it be an instruction to the Committee to omit Clause 30 and any other references to the abandonment of a portion of the Cromford Canal."—(*Mr. Brunner.*)

*SIR E. BOYLE (Taunton) appealed to the House to allow the Bill to go forward so that it could go upstairs and be decided on its merits. If anything was done to stop the Bill here the rights of the case would never be known. One hon. Member had said that the canal was subsiding owing to the coal having been extracted, and suggested that the railway company should buy the coal themselves, which according to the first speaker had already been consumed. The company's proposals were carefully explained to the Royal Commission on Canals and Waterways, and that Commission decided to leave the matter to the Board of Trade, and the latter had held an inquiry, and generally concurred in the application now made. In 1890 part of the tunnel fell in and it took four years to repair it; but notwithstanding the repairs, and that the greatest precautions were taken, in 1894 the tunnel fell in again. He did not think under those circumstances that this was a matter upon which any company should be compelled to lay out any great sum of money. The canal would cost £250,000, properly to rebuild and repair and was not worth the trouble and expense. Although there were nine petitions against the Bill in the Upper House, and after a full inquiry the House of Lords passed it. He hoped the hon. Member would not persist in stopping an inquiry, and he for one should vote against any proposal to do so.

SIR MAURICE LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough) hoped the instruction would be carried. The hon. Member who had just sat down had said that it was very difficult to put this canal into proper working order, and that it took four years to repair when the tunnel fell in in 1890, but he omitted to state that the cost was less than £7,500. It took four years because the company were unwilling to carry out their statutory obligations; now, because the canal was not a financial success they asked to be relieved of their obligations altogether. The report of the committee showed that the railway company had done everything to discourage the canal traffic. When they took over the canal the traffic was 140,000 tons per annum, and it was now only 30,000 to 40,000 tons. When the company took over the canal statutory obligations were imposed upon them to keep sufficient water in the canal to maintain it in a navigable condition. This they had not done, and hence traffic was diverted from the canals. The borough of Loughborough had for years sent the residuals from their gasworks by canal, and if the Cromford Tunnel were closed and the railway company absolved from keeping the canal open for traffic, it would cost the ratepayers of Loughborough £100 a year for carting the residuals from their gas works.

*MR. CROSSLEY (Cheshire, Altrincham) thought it would be a dangerous precedent if Parliament allowed this railway to get out of its engagements in the manner proposed. Parliament made a great mistake when it allowed the railways to buy up and control so many canals. They controlled nearly one-third of the canal system of the country, and their control was very much to the disadvantage of the canals. This company was bound to maintain this canal, and why it should be allowed to get out of that obligation he did not know. It had neglected its duty, and he thought it had done so wilfully. Far worse expenditure had taken place in regard to other canals, where there was a subsidence of thirty feet, but still they had been built up. If they allowed this canal to be closed and the water supply cut off, they would soon have the Great Northern Railway wanting to close the Nottingham Canal, and instead of extending our canal system as we ought, we should find it was being curtailed. If this canal was allowed to be cut in two in the way proposed the millowners and quarry-owners would be left at the mercy of the railway company. In one case it had already so operated that a quarry-owner had lost a contract for the supply of stone owing to the high rates charged by the railway company, with the result that the order for the stone went to Norway. It was to the advantage of the railway companies to prevent canal traffic going on in order to get that traffic on to their own lines. Canal traffic was far cheaper and of great advantage to the country, and anyone conversant with the canal system on the Continent would never consent to any further cutting down of the canal system in this country. It seemed to him a bold stroke on the part of the Midland Railway Company to appeal to Parliament to close a canal while the Royal Commission on Canals and Waterways was inquiring into the advisability of reconstruction and extension. He hoped the House would delete Clause 30.

*MR. MORTON (Sutherland) said that no attempt had been made to prevent this Bill from going upstairs, hon. Members having very wisely decided to fight the question on one clause and allow the remainder of the Bill to go up in any case. There was a great principle involved in the question of the waterways and canals of this country, and the House ought to protest now against their being destroyed although they had not done so in the past. Ever since 1851 the policy of the railways had been to obtain possession of and to close the canals of the country and to prevent competition. Goods could be carried much more cheaply by water than by any other method, although railways could carry them faster, and it ought to be the policy of the House to keep these waterways open for the use and benefit of the trade, and the people. He had expected to hear someone who represented the railway company state what the company was prepared to do for the public in return for Parliament allowing them to get out of this obligation, but no offer whatever had been made, although the company wished to be relieved of a great expenditure which they undertook for a concession they got from Parliament. He trusted under the circumstances that the House would eliminate the clause.

*MR. KEARLEY said the question before the House was whether the Midland Railway Company should be compelled to maintain this canal from end to end. At about the middle of the canal there was a tunnel a mile and three-quarters in length, and owing to a subsidence it had fallen in, and at this point the traffic was absolutely blocked. In other places the water in the canal was no longer at its ordinary level. It was not denied by the company that they were under statutory obligations to maintain the canal and keep it open for navigation during its entire length. But at intervals since 1889 the canal at this part had been closed owing to the subsidences which had taken place, and since 1900 the tunnel had been entirely closed. Apart from this, the company had showed no particular anxiety to keep the other portions of the canal open for navigation; they had neglected to keep up their reservoirs and had allowed one to fall to one-third of its natural capacity. In this connection repeated complaints had been made to the Board of Trade, pointing out the serious manner in which trade was handicapped, and the Board of Trade took advantage of certain powers they possessed. Under the Railway and Canal Traffic Act they appointed Sir William Matthews to make an investigation, and had received a Report from him that had been presented to the House. He thought this question ought to be very carefully considered, and the Board of Trade had given it the most careful consideration. They could not ignore the fact that there was a most important Royal Commission sitting at the present moment to inquire into the question of waterways and canals which ran between them. It so happened that this canal constituted a very important part of the canal system of the country, and though only fifteen miles in length, it was a feeder to a system which ran to Nottingham, Derby, and the Humber. Having regard to all these considerations, the Board of Trade did not propose to offer any objection to the acceptance of this instruction.

Question put, and agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

Ordered, That, in the case of the Midland Railway Bill [Lords], Standing Orders 82, 211, 236, and 237 be suspended, and that the Committee of Selection have leave to appoint the Committee on the Bill to sit and proceed upon Wednesday next.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

SUPPLY.

(CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES.)

Postponed Proceeding on Question, "That a sum, not exceeding £128,735, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of His Majesty's Secretary of State of the Home Department and Subordinate Offices, resumed."

(Mr. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) in the Chair.)

*MR. SMEATON (Stirlingshire) said there was a Motion in his name for the reduction of the Secretary of State's salary, his object being simply to draw his attention to the volume of evidence given before the Royal Commission on vivisection. That volume contained revelations of the most startling kind, and it was perfectly clear that the law of 1876 was habitually disobeyed, and in some cases flagrantly violated; in the operations of vivisection the motives of humanity seemed to be very little realised and hardly even to influence the operators. As the right hon. Gentleman was aware, a very large body of opinion was being directed to this subject, not only in this country, but also abroad—in the United States and in Continental countries. There were hundreds of thousands of His Majesty's subjects, of both sexes, —largely of the gentler sex—who were deeply moved by the disclosures now before the Royal Commission. Opinion was growing that there must be a great deal more humanity shown in vivisection operations than was at present manifested.

The opinion was also held that if the Government could not control these vivisection operations efficiently and thoroughly they had far better abolish vivisection altogether. In 1905, although there were actually 38,000 experiments, only twenty-three of these were inspected at a cost of 850 guineas to the State. Of these 38,000 experiments, 2,506 were vivisection properly so-called; the rest were probably inoculations. In the past three years, out of 89,519 operations, only ninety-three were inspected, at a cost of 2,581 guineas. He thought that was a flagrant waste of public money. There were two inspectors who received, one 500 guineas and the other 350 guineas. These gentlemen were not whole-time officers, but they received whole-time fees. They got the equivalent of the salaries of many professional men, and he was obliged to conclude that not only was there a waste of public money for which the Home Office was responsible, but the inspectors were inefficient and the inspections absurdly few. In fact the whole organisation of inspection was a farce—a ridiculous farce; and for very shame, if for no other reason, reform—and immediate reform—was urgent. Another extraordinary disclosure of the volume was that the Home Office took no steps whatever to detect or investigate cases of unlicensed vivisection. The law laid down that inspectors were from time to time to visit registered places where vivisection was carried on, and it laid down a set of conditions for the legal conduct of these experiments which the inspectors were supposed to watch constantly. It was perfectly plain that if the Home Office gave no instructions to its inspectors to detect and inquire into cases of unlicensed vivisection, unlicensed operations would go on at a rate which those who had spoken to him on the subject thought was positively alarming. He found in the same year, 1905, there were sixty contraventions of the Act, of which one only was the result of official investigation and detection, and fifty-nine were due to the confessions of the experimenters themselves. If there were fifty-nine experimenters who confessed that they had contravened the law, how many hundreds, possibly thousands, were there who did not confess? Although the Commissioners in 1876 recommended that there should be inquiry into the humanity with which these experiments were conducted by the operators, yet no such inquiry had been made. And in this respect he would like to quote a passage from a letter by Professor Huxley, who was a member of the Commission in 1875. In his letter to Darwin Professor Huxley called himself "the counsel for science;" that was to say that he was anxious that these vivisection experiments should always have scientific results. He wrote:—

> "I have felt it my duty to act as counsel for science, and was well satisfied with the way things were going. But on Thursday, when I was absent at the Council of the Royal Society, Mr. Klein was examined, and, if what I hear is a correct account of the evidence he gave, I may as well throw up my brief. I am told that he most openly professed the most entire indifference to animal suffering, and said he only gave animals anæsthetics to keep them quiet. I declare that I did not know that a man lived who was such an unmitigated cynical brute as to profess and act upon such principles, and I would willingly agree to any law which would send him to the treadmill."

That was the opinion of a great scientist who would have gone a great length to forward the interests of scientific research; and yet that was what, in his hot indignation, he said, and how he cursed the cruelty which which the so-called scientific research caused to the dumb creatures who minister so greatly to our pleasure, happiness, and comfort! At the present time there were no means of ascertaining whether a candidate for a licence was a man likely to show humanity in his operations. Questions and answers in the Report showed that the inspectors depended wholly on the good faith of the licensee that the conditions of the Act were observed. Then again, it was reported that the use of the drug called curari was not uncommon. This curari was absolutely prohibited by Clause 4 of the Act. The effect of curari was to paralyse the motor nerves and the muscular action while the subject was at the same time under the influence of the anæsthetic; when the influence of the anæsthetic was exhausted the effect of the curari still continued, and the unfortunate animal was unable to move a muscle or make a struggle to show the pain it was in. Then again, another violation of the law was that anæsthetics were not uncommonly applied, not by the operator himself, but by what he called his laboratory boy—a person who knew nothing whatever about anæsthetics, had no responsibility whatever, but simply administered the anæsthetic for as long as he thought fit, while the operator himself was absolutely paying no attention to the condition of the animal. Then, again, there was evidence of the probable frequency of illegal vivisections. He found that the Home Secretary in 1901 admitted in June or July that Messrs. Burroughs and Wellcome held no licence, although they were carrying on vivisection. Notwithstanding this offence against the law, the Home Secretary granted them a licence in September of the same year. That seemed to him a very gross violation of the law. These people were carrying on illegal vivisection and breaking the law, and not only were they not prosecuted, but they were actually granted two licences. He thought that was a condition of affairs which warranted very severe condemnation. Another point was that according to the Act of 1876 the licences were to be signed by certain distinguished professional bodies, and it was especially laid down that if the candidate himself belonged to one of those bodies, he must not sign his own certificate. He found that a very eminent professional man, Professor Starling, was reported to have actually signed his own certificate under which his licence was granted. The House had been listening for several hours to the importance of inspection of factories and workshops in order to prevent anything like an approach to hardship to men and women workers; and there was not one man in the House who was not in sympathy with the appeals which had been made. But surely the dumb creatures who depended upon us and who were so helpful to us merited some consideration at their hands at least to prevent positive cruelty and torture at the whim of so-called scientific operations? What a melancholy contrast between the diligent and strenuous inspection of factories and the miserable sham inspections of the shambles devoted to vivisection! He suggested that the inspectors should be largely increased in number, and the Home Office put in a position to judge whether they had conducted their inspections efficiently. There ought, too, to be high fees charged for licences, which should go towards the remuneration in part of the increased body of inspectors. He would be out of order in suggesting changes in legislation. But he urged on the right hon. Gentleman the need of vigilance and of drastic reform in the direction of inspection, and of checking of the present barefaced neglect of the law. He hoped much would come of the Report of the Commission; and meantime the country would watch the operations of vivisection with a jealous eye.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS said he wished to dissociate himself from the remarks of the hon. Member with regard to the inhumanity of the administration of the Vivisection Act. His experience was that the administration of that Act and the conduct of the inspectors was most humane. He was certain there was nothing like undue cruelty.

Mr. SMEATON said he had never imputed to the inspectors that they condoned cruelty, but that they did not take the opportunity of examining the cases.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS said in that respect then he had misunderstood the hon. Member. But the hon. Member had said that sufficient care was not taken in granting licences to members of the profession.

Sir F. BANBURY (City of London) said that some hon. Members on that side agreed with the hon. Member opposite. They did not complain for a moment of the action of the inspectors, but they felt very strongly that they were insufficient in number.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS said there had been made against those who carried on this scientific work a great many charges which could not be justified on examination. In his opinion due care was taken to see that licences were not scattered broadcast, but were granted only to those who were authoritatively recommended. Referring to the Aliens Act, he expressed his satisfaction at the deportation under that Act of foreign criminals who had been convicted in this country. The consequent decrease in the number of such prisoners was very marked. In 1905 he remembered that the alien prison population was increasing and it increased in a greater ratio than other prisoners. In 1906, in the English prisons, whilst the total of British prisoners fell by 6·32 per cent., the aliens total fell by 16·85 per cent.; that was, they fell from 4,098 to 3,399, leaving the total lower than at any other time since 1899. Those figures were very satisfactory. He asked whether any circular had been sent to quarter sessions and other courts calling attention to the clauses of the Act. As the Home Office had no power to deport a criminal alien without a certificate from the court, it was essential that courts of quarter sessions should be informed of their responsibilities under the Aliens Act. He had two questions to put in reference to the settlement of the dispute between Messrs. Kynoch and the Home Office. Had Messrs. Kynoch given up their contention that the use of mercuric chloride was not in contravention of the terms of their licence; and had they given an assurance to abide by the construction put on the terms of their licence by the Home Office? Did the agreement come to with the Home Office also bind the Admiralty and War Office and prevent them from taking action against Messrs. Kynoch with respect to the ammunition they had supplied to the Army and Navy?

*Mr. GLADSTONE said he gladly responded to the appeal made to him by the right hon. Gentleman. He did not know whether Messrs. Kynoch had given up their view that the use of mercuric chloride was not in contravention of the law, but they had given the Home Office the assurance that they would abide by the decision of the court of quarter sessions and discontinue the use of this unauthorised ingredient, and that they would strictly observe the terms of their licences. If the firm has given the Home Office that assurance in a *bona fide* manner—and he was bound to say he thought they had—it did not matter to the Home Office if they reserved a pious opinion as to whether or not their action was or was not against the law. The object of the Home Office was to get sufficient protection for the public, and they felt certain they had secured that object. His answer to the other question of the right hon. Gentleman was in the negative. The Home Office dealt with Messrs. Kynoch only so far as Home Office questions were concerned, and the War Office and Admiralty could deal with the firm in their own relations as they thought fit. In answer to other questions, he said that in December, 1905, a circular explaining the expulsion clauses of the Aliens Act had been sent to the courts of quarter sessions, and a further circular on the same subject had recently been sent to police authorities. It was not intended to proceed with the Eight Hours Bill this session after the measure had been introduced for the consideration of the country. He hoped the Report of the Metropolitan Police Commission would soon be issued. He agreed that it was most undesirable that its publication should be further delayed. A question had been asked as to the expulsion orders under the Aliens Act. That part of the Act had been administered with good results. He was glad to believe that the expulsions which had been already effected had produced a very considerable improvement, more particularly in the very worst class of disorderly houses in the metropolis. He considered that part of the Act a valuable provision of the law, and he would do his best to make it still more useful in its application. He had been asked a question in regard to the Berne Convention on the use of yellow phosphorus. It was not true to say that this country was isolated in its position. Japan, Norway, Sweden, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Spain, and Portugal took up the same position. The question raised by the hon. Member for Stirlingshire was one of great importance and interest, but it was also one of an extremely complicated nature. He did not hesitate to admit that the administration of the law relating to vivisection had given him a great deal of difficulty. He was quite conscious that, not being a surgeon, physician, or physiologist, he could not penetrate into the mysteries of these things. All he could do, as all his predecessors had done, was to exercise such common sense as he possessed in the administration of the law, and he would say that he and those associated with him had worked the law to the best of their ability. He agreed with his right hon. friend in his protest against any thought being entertained that either the inspectors or any of those concerned in the administration of the law were in the least degree wanting in humanity, or that they were more deficient in humanity than any of those who thought it their duty to attack the law and those whose duty it was to administer it. Although he had great sympathy with the views of the hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House who were opposed to vivisection, he honestly felt that this was a matter in which sentiment had to be kept with considerable strictness within the bounds of reason.

SIR F. BANBURY said he did that in all cases.

*MR. GLADSTONE said he had been aware for a long time of the interest the hon. Baronet took in dumb animals. As to the use of curari he had to say that it was never used by itself. It was sometimes used, but it was always accompanied by an anæsthetic. His hon. friend had stated that Professor Starling had signed his own licence. That was a statement which might be misinterpreted by the Committee. Under the law a licence had to be signed by a professor of physiology, and by a member of the College of Physicians and Surgeons. Professor Starling was a professor of physiology, and the signing of his own licence relieved him of the necessity of getting the signature of another professor of physiology. He had not heard of the particular case, but he imagined that that was the instance to which his hon. friend alluded. He would suggest to his hon. friend that it was impossible to carry this matter further on the present occasion. This was a matter of very great importance and difficulty, and for that reason he was instrumental in advising His Majesty to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into it. Until the questions raised by the hon. Member for Stirlingshire had been thoroughly considered and the Report of the Royal Commission received, he could not take any action except that of administering as well as he could the law as he found it. His right hon. friend the Member for the Forest of Dean had said that there had been retrogression in the administration of the law in regard to lead poisoning.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said he did not use the word retrogression in connection with the administration of the law by the Home Office.

*MR GLADSTONE, admitting that that was so, said he wished to state in clear and distinct terms that, as a matter of fact, there had been no alteration in the position of the Home Office during the last ten years in regard to this question. They used every effort to discourage the use of lead, and in those cases where they could not prohibit its use, and where its use was inevitable, or essential, they discouraged the use of dangerous forms of it. He assured his right hon. friend that there would be no change at all. The right hon. Gentleman had alluded to a speech attributed to one of his respected colleagues at the Home Office, to whom he paid a proper tribute for his public spirit. He had had communications with Mr. Cunynghame, and he understood that the report of that speech was not a shorthand one, and was not in fact accurate. A corrected report was not sent by Mr. Cunynghame.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said the *Journal of the Society of Arts* gave opportunities for correction, and, as the subject was a dangerous one, he assumed that the report was corrected.

*MR. GLADSTONE said that the matter was probably explained by the fact that Mr. Cunynghame had had to go away for his health. Mr. Cunynghame had asked him to express his regret that the misunderstanding had arisen. Mr. Cunynghame's personal attitude was that he yielded to no one in the earnest desire that a substitute for lead could be found. He (Mr. Cunynghame) said this most emphatically, and in support of it wished to add that he had procured and read everything that had been written about leadless glazes in English, French, German, or Italian, and it was only with the greatest regret that he feared that the abolition of lead throughout English pottery was impracticable. He (Mr. Gladstone) could assure the right hon. Gentleman, so far as the Home Office was concerned, that not only would there be no retrogression, but that they would do everything in their power to stem the apparent increase in the number of cases of lead poisoning and so prevent what was undoubtedly a great evil. The hon. Member for Monmouth had referred to the question of life-saving apparatus in mines. They believed that it was necessary to proceed cautiously in the matter. Perhaps the Committee were not aware that after the Courrières disaster some German life-saving apparatus was bought and some men went down the mine. Unfortunately something went wrong and the man who had the apparatus lost his life and two who had not any apparatus were uninjured. It was quite clear, therefore, that science was still somewhat at fault; and the Royal Commission had found that it was impossible to say at the present moment that any particular apparatus was so above suspicion and so much better than any other that they could advise the Government to recommend its use. The hon. Member for Clitheroe had devoted most of his speech to the question of time-cribbing. A magistrate could take his own action as to whether or not he would fine in every case, but he agreed that a small fine of £10 was not a deterrent to time-cribbing on the part of a great company. The hon. Member referred had to one case where an inspector apparently discouraged the help of the police. He would inquire into that. He thought it would be most unfortunate if the co-operation of the police was discouraged in any way. He was sorry that the hon. Member for Leicester had made a remark which seemed to cast some aspersion upon Dr. Whitelegge. He did not think the hon. Member could have meant it. The medical experience of Dr. Whitelegge had been of inestimable advantage to the industrial population of the country and of immense use to him in his administration of the Factory Department. He had the fullest trust and belief in Dr. Whitelegge's capacity, and he was glad on this occasion to make an acknowledgment of the public service which he had rendered. He believed the educational value of the examination which was now enforced was very great indeed and enabled them to secure the services of competent men to discharge the difficult duties imposed upon them under the Factory and Workshops Act. The hon. Member for Leicester had denounced the organisation of the Factory Department of the Home Office, and pressed him to say that a Select Committee would be appointed to inquire into it. He would say frankly and fairly that he would have nothing to do with the appointment of a Select Committee. If he thought it necessary he would be a party to its appointment at once, but he did not. Moreover, the Factory Department was at present working at full stretch, and he would ask the hon. Member to consider the effect the appointment of a Committee of Inquiry would have at the present time. It would dishearten and disorganise the whole of the Department and would stop the good work going on. It would be disastrous in its effect, and he did not believe it would produce any good results. He could not therefore in any sense assent to his hon. friend's proposal. The appointment of a Royal Commission with regard to mines offered no parallel, because there was no Department on Mines at the Home Office and the question had to be considered in relation to the inspectorate. He thought that the Commission might give some valuable suggestions with regard to the inspectorate; and he preferred to leave the whole question till the Royal Commission had reported. The Factory Department had, however, not only been growing for years, but it had been growing in strength and efficiency from year to year, and he was not going to put a stop to that growth and development. On the contrary, he would encourage it by every means in his power and not discourage and disorganise the Department by appointing a Select Committee to inquire into its work.

*MR. F. E. SMITH (Liverpool, Walton) said that he wished to direct attention to an entirely different subject; but one which had been repeatedly discussed by Question and answer across the floor of the House. He referred, as the Committee was probably aware, to what had become known as the Edalji case. If one were to attempt to open the whole of the case adequately, it would certainly take at least two days to do it; and he should devote himself, not to that object, but to the modest object of convincing the Committee that there was a *prima facie* case that even in regard to the reparation which the Home Office had recently made there had been a very grave miscarriage of justice on the findings of the Committee which the right hon. Gentleman had himself appointed. It was in no sense a Party question, for if there was any reflection at all upon the Home Office that reflection, at least to some extent, attached to the office in the days when it was presided over by his right hon. friend. He mentioned this to show that there was no hope and no intention of making Party capital out of the question. The only charge against the Home Office, as an office, lay in the practice which had been adopted for many years of not interfering with sentences unless some fresh evidence presented itself. That being their principle, it was clear that the Home Office under the presidency neither of the right hon. Gentleman nor of his predecessor could give very great relief in such a case as the Edalji case. When the Criminal Appeal Bill was under discussion, the right hon. Gentleman spoke with contempt of newspaper commissioners.

*MR. GLADSTONE: Not with contempt.

*MR. F. E. SMITH said he gathered that that was the tenor of the right hon. Gentleman's observations. The only observation he had to make with regard to that was that the reparation which had already been made—first, the admission that Edalji was entitled to have a grossly excessive sentence of seven years reduced to three years, and, secondly, that there existed adequate reasons for giving him a free pardon—had been brought about by the agitation which took place in the newspaper Press, and in which Mr. Labouchere and Sir Arthur Conan Doyle were conspicuous and disinterested figures. He had no right whatever to claim any of the credit of the Edalji incident, and of the reduction of the sentence which his right hon. friend thought was just. The credit belonged to Mr. Labouchere and Sir Arthur Doyle, and he had no share in it. Passing from the newspaper commissioners let him ask the House to consider what were the circumstances under which the only charge which still survived—the charge of having written certain anonymous letters—first came to be made. The Rev. S. Edalji, who twenty-seven years ago became vicar of Great Wyrley, and who was the father of Mr. George Edalji, was a Parsee by origin occupying the anomalous position of a clergyman in the Church of England, and was not likely to be very popular among a provincial community. The Rev. S. Edalji, Mrs. Edalji, and Miss Edalji were witnesses against whose credibility no one had ever made any allegation. The family however, for a considerable number of years past had bitter, powerful, and rancorous enemies in the parish in which they lived. The material circumstances in connection with these anonymous letters was that from 1892 to 1896 a series of anonymous letters was addressed to Mr. Edalji, the father, letters which were couched in an extraordinary vein and which presented many points of analogy to the letters of a later date of which the right hon. Gentleman still said that Edalji was the author. It was impossible to form a judgment on the later anonymous letters unless they formed a judgment on the letters which preceded them. The first step in fact which the Committee must grasp was that the first letters bore great marks of resemblance to the later ones, and on the face of them were the work of a man determined to injure the younger Edalji, and disclosing every symptom of a disordered mind. The first letters were in the handwriting of an adult, and were written when George Edalji was sixteen or seventeen years of age. They were written to the father. One of them read as follows—

> "My dear Shaparje,
>
> "I have great pleasure in informing you that it is now our intention to renew the persecution of the Vicar of Great Wyrley . . . revenge, revenge on you. . . . I have to-day posted in your name postcards of a most hellish nature . . . you are sure to be arrested.
>
> Yours in Satan."

On 17th March the following letter was received—

> "I swear by God that I will murder George Edalji and F. B. soon; the only thing I care about in this world is revenge, revenge, sweet revenge, then I shall be happy, yes happy, in hell, in hell, in hell . . . Now I seldom bet, but I will bet this time that your kid and F. B. will before the end of this year be either in the graveyard or disgraced for life. . . . I do not think Hell is such a bad place after all and I long, yes I long, to be there rolling in the flames of Hell-fire that shall never be quenched . . . . never, never, never. I know that I am lost, oh, oh, oh, Christ, Christ, Christ help me! Oh, I am lost, God have mercy, Christ help. Every day, every hour, my hatred is growing against George Edalji and F. B. If I could get into an empty railway compartment with them I would do for them both."

He did not think anyone acquainted with the psychology of crime would say that the author of those letters was George Edalji aged seventeen and of unimpeached sanity. About this time advertisements of a scurrilous character were inserted in the papers at some slight expense which were extremely annoying to the Rev. Mr. Edalji. From 1892 to 1896 this first batch of anonymous letters continued and then nothing was received from 1896 to 1903. There was complete silence in the whole matter. The man who wrote them might have been in gaol or a lunatic asylum or have changed his work. He asked the Committee to form a picture of what George Edalji was in 1903. In the first place, he was aged twenty-eight years, a man of studious habits, who had left the Rugeley grammar school with a good character from every teacher, and proceeded to the Mason College at Birmingham to study law, which college he left without a single testimonial which was not a good testimonial. He gained prizes and scholarships, and at the age of twenty-eight he produced a book upon railway law which bore every evidence both of industry and capacity. No charge whatever had been brought against him; on the contrary, he had received testimonials as to moral character from every man who had had opportunities of judging him from day to day observation. The only circumstance which had been or could be alleged against him was that at the age of twenty-eight he was in pecuniary difficulties—a not uncommon circumstance in the case of men of his position in life qualifying for an expensive profession. In February, 1903, horrible cattle-maiming began in the neighbourhood in which he resided. Then commenced a second list of anonymous letters, addressed this time to the police. The suggested authorship of the second batch of anonymous letters was the only justification for the stigma which the right hon. Gentleman continued to impose on this unfortunate man. [Some cries of "Oh."] The right hon. Gentleman's own Committee had found that at the time these outrages took place the police in the district were being universally discredited because of their failure to discover the offender. The Committee said—

> "The police were extremely anxious to bring the offender to justice, having been baffled on every side."

Mr. F. E. Smith.

Let hon. Members read the first letter upon which the right hon. Gentleman said he would not clear the character of this man, or give him compensation, because he thought some tribunal might find that Edalji had written these letters. The first letter was written to the police in March, 1903. It ran—

> "I know all about horses and beasts, and how to catch them best. I had never done none before till these two horses near the line at Wyrley . . . I caught them both lying down at ten to three and they roused up and I caught them each under the belly, but they didn't spurt much blood . . . I know all the Edaljis. It is not true we always do it when moon young, and the one Edalji killed on 11th April was full moon night."

The second letter, on which the expert, Mr. Gurrin, expressed his opinion, which this competent lawyer was supposed to have written to the police, began—

> "Edalji is going to Brum on Sunday night to see the Captain near Northfield about how its to be carried on with so many detectives about, and I believe they are going to do some cows in the day time. You bloated blackguard, I will shoot you with father's gun through your thick head if you come my way. I don't remember writing this letter, but I may have."

No tribunal up to the present time had ever found that he had written those letters. How could the writing of such a letter as the second be imputed to a sane man? He challenged the right hon. Gentleman to state what could be the motive. The third letter was sent to a boy in the village and said—

> "Colonel Bridgeman has granted a warrant to arrest you for killing cattle. There is a warrant for George Edalji and F. W. I have warned Edalji . . . told him what to do to save yourselves."

If the case were founded on those two letters it was complete against the hypothesis on which the right hon. Gentleman had chosen to base himself. But there was a postcard also, and would it be believed that the expert Gurrin committed himself to the view that Edalji was not only the author of those three letters, but also of this postcard, which was addressed to Edalji himself, at the solicitor's office where he worked, and where everyone could read it? It was couched in terms so foul and shameful that he should not be tolerated if he read them; he would only say that it charged Edalji with having committed acts of immorality with a lady justly and universally respected in the neighbourhood. They were asked to believe that such a thing could be done by a man to whom insanity had never been imputed. It was suggested that the authorship of these anonymous letters was brought home to Edalji at the trial. He was careful to speak with the greatest possible respect of the deputy-chairman who presided at the trial, yet the right hon. Gentleman's own Committee had pointed out that this Edalji case was one of very great inherent difficulty. This trial was before a lay bench presided over, not by the ordinary chairman, but by the deputy-chairman, assisted by no legal advice to guide him through the maze of these difficulties, with no clerk even sitting there, but with the occasional assistance of a member of the junior bar, who was not, able to remain in Court during the whole of the hearing of these most difficult and intricate charges. The trial of Edalji was most unsatisfactory. There were two indictments, one for killing a pony, and the second was as to the authorship of the letters. And here he would say at once that if the charge had been tried by the jury on the second issue the case he was submitting would have been incomparably weaker; in fact the prosecution decided to abandon the second of these charges, or at any rate did not proceed upon it, and confined themselves to the charge of wounding. It was a charge of wounding without any specific issue being left to the jury, and they were asked by the right hon. Gentleman's Committee to infer that the jury thought that Edalji had written these letters. He knew that no consideration would influence this Committee so much as the disquieting possibility that this man after all might be completely innocent of the horrible offence with which he was charged. He did not argue that, he had too much experience of criminal cases to insult the intelligence of the Committee by attempting within the space of an hour to treat a case the trial of which occupied two or three days. He would confront the right hon. Gentleman with one most sinister and disquieting passage from the Report of his Committee—

> "The police carried out their investigations, not for the purpose of finding out who was the guilty party, but for the purpose of finding out evidence against Edalji."

Those who had conducted prosecutions on police evidence knew the appalling risks which arose where the police approached a case with a preconceived conviction of the guilt of the accused, and there was no one who had ever practised at the Criminal Bar to whom the preliminary finding reached by the right hon. Gentleman's Committee was not full of cause for anxiety. The Committee declared it was doubtful if the jury would have convicted at all if they had not been in some way influenced by the anonymous letters. They said—

> "The conviction was unsatisfactory, and after a full consideration of all the facts we cannot agree with the verdict of the jury."

It was a principle of English law that if the prosecution failed to substantiate the charge and prove the prisoner guilty he was to be treated as innocent of the offence with which he was charged, and he protested that the findings of the right hon. Gentleman's Committee amounted to this, that with all the cruelty and consequential injuries which were involved, they imprisoned for three years a man on whom, by their own showing, they had no right to lay a hand. What was the justification for that? The only justification suggested either by the right hon. Gentleman's Committee or by the right hon. Gentleman himself, was that Edalji wrote those letters. He made no attack on the intelligence or honesty of the expert witness, Gurrin, upon the handwriting, and believed he intended to give honest evidence; but he was discredited by the evidence he had given in reference to handwriting in the Beck case. The right hon. Gentleman should remember the opinion expressed of the greatest expert in handwriting who was called by Maître Labori in the Dreyfus trial, and who, like Sir Forrest Fulton, regarded evidence as to handwriting at all times with the greatest suspicion. What was in effect the position of the Home Office? The jury found the man guilty on no other charge than that of killing the pony. Now, the one point upon which a jury were competent to pronounce was whether a man was or was not guilty of such a charge, but a question which they were least competent to decide was whether a man wrote certain letters in a matter of disputed caligraphy. The right hon. Gentleman bound himself to some supposed finding of the jury upon an issue upon which they were not competent to pronounce an opinion, while overruling their actual decision on a matter well within their competence. If it were true that there never was a finding that Edalji wrote these letters, let him ask whence the findings came which made it impossible for the right hon. Gentleman to relieve the man from the stigmas—he would say nothing at the moment about compensation—which destroyed his whole professional career as finally as if the original verdict of the jury had stood. He wished to speak of members of the committee with profound respect, but with even greater respect of the criticisms and comments of the most experienced and able Judge who sat in the Court of Appeal when he was nominated for the committee. He would read what Sir Robert Romer said.

*MR. GLADSTONE said the letter of Sir Robert Romer was written after he became a member of the committee.

*MR. F. E. SMITH said it was not disputed that Sir Robert Romer wrote this letter, and he was not a man to change his mind. The letter said—

> "It appears to me that, if such an inquiry is embarked upon, it must be done according to the ordinary rules of procedure governing a criminal trial. It ought to be public, or not at all. Witnesses ought to be examined and cross-examined."

If that had been done there would have been very little heard of the Edalji case. That view was not adopted and as far as the authorship of those letters was concerned the Committee would hardly credit that there was not any finding by the right hon. Gentleman's Committee which showed that they ever brought their own judgment to bear on the question whether Edalji wrote the letters or not. They said—

> "We are unable to disagree with what we take to be the finding of the jury as to the letters."

They assumed the finding of the jury, and said they were unable to disagree with what they took to be the finding of the jury. They said—

> "We are not prepared to dissent from the finding at which we think that the jury arrived."

It was not pretended that this committee, eminent though its members were, had any particular knowledge of handwriting, and quite obviously they never brought to bear on the authorship of the letters their own independent judgment. They purported to found themselves on a supposed verdict of the jury which was never given. On internal evidence it was incredible that Edalji ever wrote these letters; secondly, no tribunal ever found that he had written them; thirdly, no tribunal had ever tried him for writing these letters. He commended that to the attention of the right hon. Gentleman, with the reminder that the man was besmirched with the insinuation that he wrote the letters and was refused any inquiry as to whether he wrote them or not. While Edalji was in gaol a horse was killed by ripping. A man called Green confessed to that outrage. The police knew that he had confessed. Inspector Campbell, with Green's confession in his pocket, was asked, "Have you found out who did it? He answered, "No, Sir," and afterwards said, "I beg your pardon, we have an idea." "Has nobody admitted that he did it?" he was asked, and when further asked "Is he in Court?" the answer was "Yes." Would it be believed that this man Green was permitted to leave the country a few weeks afterwards, and no charge was brought against him, and that he was never arrested ? On 2nd November, eight days after the conviction, two horses were mutilated in the same way, and on 24th March following two ewes and a lamb had their throats cut and a man was convicted for that offence, and the prosecution had adopted the suggestion that Edalji was a member of a gang. He would confront the right hon. Gentleman with the evidence of his own committee, who reported—

> "Of the existence of a gang there appears to be no evidence."

In Staffordshire the opinion was that those who imprisoned their fellow-subjects incurred some small responsibility, and the recurrence of these outrages shocked the public conscience. Consequently a petition signed by 10,000 persons was presented to the Home Secretary asking for a reconsideration of the case, and a Mr. Yelverton wrote to the chief constable of the district, the official directly responsible for the conduct of the police. The chief constable, in reply wrote—

> "November 8th, 1903.
>
> "Dear Sir,
>
> "I beg to acknowledge your further letter inclosing some more testimonials to George Edalji's general good character. It is right to tell you that you will find it a simple waste of time to attempt to prove that George Edalji could not, owing to his position and alleged good character, have been guilty of writing offensive and abominable letters. His father is as well aware as I am of his proclivities in the direction of anonymous writing, and several other people have personal knowledge on the same subject."

The Committee would realise now why he had laid stress on the unblemished reputation of the elder Edalji. The statement made by the chief constable was not only false in itself, but it was repudiated by Mr. Edalji, sen., The recipient wrote back at once and said these were most serious allegations and challenged the chief constable to produce the name of a single man who would come forward and substantiate the allegation that Edalji wrote those letters. The chief constable did not see fit to answer that letter. Was it not evident that this was a case which cried aloud for inquiry ? This very gentleman was the man who made repeated representations to the Home Office since the conviction of Edalji, and he would ask what sort of representations they were likely to be ? Were they likely to be of such a character as to lead to a fair consideration of the case by the Home Office ? The right hon. Gentleman in his speech on the Criminal Appeal Bill said there was a reason for not disclosing those representations ? Would he say whether they were in the prisoner's interest ? Did they not repeat the charges made to Mr. Yelverton ? Mr. Edalji, sen., being able to detect this particular insinuation, communicated with the right hon Gentleman and asked whether the chief constable had supplied him with any evidence in addition to that adduced at the trial for the purpose of supporting the case against his son. He should have thought that the father's petition was a reasonable one when he asked whether there was any fresh evidence to the sifting of which he might devote his scanty resources in order to vindicate his son's character. The right hon. Gentleman replied that it would be contrary to the practice of the Department to communicate the contents of reports made to him by the police in connection with applications for the exercise of the prerogative of mercy, as all such reports were of a strictly confidential character. The right hon. Gentleman was specifically asked whether there was any information in addition to what was adduced at the trial for the purpose of supporting the case of the prosecution. Was there any hon. Member on the benches opposite who would cheer the proposition that the Home Office was entitled to withhold from Mr. Edalji, sen., any additional evidence which supported the case for the prosecution ? If he had an opportunity he would gladly test whether that was the view of the Committee as a whole in the Division Lobby. What became of the indignation of this country? He recalled a time when we involved ourselves in our own virtue and talked of the secret *dossier* in France. In connection with the Criminal Appeal Bill it was stated that in the interest of prisoners, inquiries were constantly being made of a confidential character, and that information was given only because it was confidential. That line of defence would not help the right hon. Gentleman so far as his refusal disclosed in this document was concerned. He had spoken of the secret *dossier*; they had also the *chose jugée*, and for the "honour of the Army" had only to substitute the "honour of the police." He did not rest the case of Edalji in the least upon compensation. The House might judge what his claim to compensation was. His career had been destroyed, he had been in prison three years, and his father from the resources of an indigent clergyman had spent £600 in legal expenses. The strength of the case did not lie in the claim for monetary compensation but in the claim of a citizen of this country that his character should be vindicated or destroyed by a public inqury. There had been no public inquiry. He would abandon and he believed that Edalji would abandon the question of compensation if the Home Secretary would give an opportunity of a public inquiry at which the police could be examined and cross-examined with the Press present. It was to the House of Commons, and the House of Commons alone, that the right hon. Gentleman could be made responsible. It was to the House of Commons that Edalji made the last appeal which the circumstances of the case permitted him to make. He himself did not believe that the House of Commons, if the case was properly put to them, would turn to such an appeal with deaf ears. If they did so meet it, it was only left for this unhappy young man, brooding over his ruined career, the longdrawn years of his imprisonment and his branded name, to draw such consolation as he could from the reflection *civis Britannicus sum.*

*MR. GLADSTONE said the hon. and learned Gentleman had only left him five minutes in which to reply.

*MR. F. E. SMITH said he had made repeated efforts earlier in the evening to bring up the case, but he was not fortunate enough to be called upon by the Chairman.

*MR. GLADSTONE said the hon. and learned Gentleman was not present at all, so far as he knew, before dinner.

*MR. F. E. SMITH said the right hon. Gentleman had made an allegation which was totally incorrect in a point in which accuracy was specially desirable. He was present, and he consulted the Chairman as to when he might reasonably expect to be called upon, and he availed himself of the first opportunity that was given to him.

*MR. GLADSTONE said he did not observe the hon. and learned Gentleman in his place. [Cries of "Withdraw."] He did not know that the hon. and learned Gentleman had made any attempt to rise. He was absolutely unable at that hour to make a full statement on the case, and he must point out at once to the House that the hon. and learned Member had made a speech—he did not contest his right at all—on a criminal case which lasted four days when tried by a jury, and which, he said, would take him two days to set out properly before the House. He accepted the statements which the hon. and learned Member had made in perfect good faith. He was not in the least doubting his good faith, but he had given no possibility to any Member of the House of knowing anything about the history of this most important investigation. He asked the House to remember that this case was tried before a jury, and that the jury returned a unanimous verdict. He also asked the House to remember that the case had been for years before the Home Office and before his own predecessors, that it had been submitted to two Lord Chancellors, and to the law officers of the preceding Government, and that every kind of expert advice had been called into being to assist their deliberations. He must remind the House also that, for reasons which he had no time or opportunity of stating, he submitted the whole case to three gentlemen whose experience and honour could not for a moment be impugned, that they probed the case from beginning to end, that they examined every single one of the allegations of the hon. Member, and reported to him in the document which he had laid before the House of Commons. He asked the House to remember that while it was entitled to insist on every information being given to it, yet it was not a Court of Appeal, and that it would be disastrous in the highest degree if it took upon itself the functions of a Court of Appeal. He asked the House, therefore, to withhold its judgment.

And, it being Eleven of the Clock, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

LONGTON (CAROLINE STREET CHAPEL) CHARITY BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

THE STRIKE AT BELFAST.

On the Motion for the adjournment of the House,

*MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD called attention to the state of affairs existing in Belfast that day. They had information that the soldiers had again interfered with pickets legally pursuing their duties as pickets. He would point out that the military had been called out to interfere with a trade dispute before there was any systematic disturbance of the peace. Since the military had been called out there had been only two isolated cases of disturbance. The military had been called upon in anticipation of trouble. While he and his friends were perfectly willing to admit the plea that there were special circumstances in Belfast, they did urge that, if the military were to be used, the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary should use every particle of influence which he possessed with the view to the settlement of the dispute. At the present time the military were being used not to maintain law and order, but for the purpose of protracting a dispute in the interests of the employers [Cries of "Oh"]—that was their information—and to intimidate the strikers.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.) said he was always willing to give the fullest information that came to him in his official capacity. In this matter he should like the House clearly to understand that the primary responsibility for maintaining order in Belfast rested with the local authority, and it was they who had requisitioned the aid of the military. He could not say a word by way of interference with the local authorities in the discharge of their difficult duties. But he kept himself fully informed of what was taking place in Belfast, and from telegrams he had received it appeared that all parts of the town were quiet, and that the situation was unchanged. The military at the docks were reduced yesterday, and they were to be still further reduced to-day and to-morrow. This had been done after consultation with the Mayor. He had telegraphed for information during the day, and had received a reply stating that no pickets had been arrested to-day, and there were no detectives in disguise. All had passed off quietly except for the arrest of a non-union worker. The policeman who arrested him was struck over the eye, and he was treated at the hospital, but not detained. He believed the local authority were acting with considerable wisdom and discretion. His experience of life had led him to the conclusion that his good offices in the matter would be useless unless they were invited by all parties in the dispute.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S) said the circumstances in Belfast at present were exceptional. The local authority had considered it necessary that the military should be called out. The greatest difficulty at present arose out of the belief entertained in some quarters that both the police and the military were interfering with legitimate picketing. He asked the Chief Secretary to consider whether instructions could be given to the authorities in Belfast as to what constituted legal picketing during a trade dispute. If that were done misunderstandings and mistakes would be avoided. He sincerely trusted that the local authority in Belfast and the right hon. Gentleman would use all the influence they possessed to bring this lamentable strike to an end.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.) said that this subject had been sprung upon the House without notice being given to the Members for Belfast except the hon. Member for one division. His own constituency ran into a part of Belfast, and he might be permitted to say that Belfast was very well able to take care of itself. It had a reputation which was the envy of the less industrious parts of Ireland. There were very few cases of industrial strife in Belfast, and those which had occurred in the past had always been peacefully settled. He was glad that the Chief Secretary was leaving the authorities on the spot to deal with the present conflict, and to know that the right hon. Gentleman was on the side of law and order.

*Mr. STAVELEY-HILL (Staffordshire, Kingswinford) hoped that some further time would be afforded for discussion of matters connected with Home Office Vote. The police of Staffordshire had some right to be heard on the question which had been under discussion.

Mr. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) joined in the appeal. There were many questions of industrial importance that required discussion.

*Mr. J. A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden) said these representations should be conveyed to the Prime Minister, but that in his absence it was impossible for him to in any way commit the Government to afford further time for the discussion.

Adjourned at fourteen minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 19*th July*, 1907.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Bude Gas Bill; King's Norton and Northfield Urban District Council Bill.—Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Killery's Divorce Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered. To be read the third time.

Tynemouth Corporation (Water) Bill [Lords]. — As amended, considered. Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 2) Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill.—As amended, considered. To be read the third time upon Monday next.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 1) Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed.

PETITIONS.

GROCERS' LICENCES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition of the Scottish Trade Protection Society, against; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour,—From Marylebone; and, Sydenham; to lie upon the Table.

NOTIFICATION OF BIRTHS BILL.

Petition from Wandsworth, against; to lie upon the Table.

SMALL LANDHOLDERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against; From Fife; and, Grongar; to lie upon the Table.

Petition from Midlothian, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

WEEKLY REST-DAY BILL.

Petition from Harlesden and other places, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

HARBOUR, ETC., BILLS.

Return presented,—relative thereto [ordered 18th July; *Mr. Lloyd-George*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 261.]

CIVIL SERVANTS (RETIREMENT AT THE AGE OF SIXTY-FIVE).

Return presented; relative thereto [ordered 18th July; *Mr. Runciman*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 262.]

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1887.

Copy presented; of the Treasury Minute, dated 15th July, 1907, granting a Retired allowance to Mr. Harry Banks, Officer of Beeston Station, Second Class, Inland Revenue, under the Act [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Charge of Disturbance against a St. John's Wood Postman.

MR. STEADMAN (Finsbury, Central): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that a postman at St. John's Wood, while on his holidays, gave a party at his house; that afterwards an anonymous letter, complaining of piano playing and singing at untimely hours and alleging damage through the carelessness of his visitors, was sent to the postal authorities; whether he is aware that not only was the postman called upon to answer to these charges, but the postal authorities sought evidence from another postman living near; whether he will state under what regulations postal

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

servants are called upon to explain officially such charges as these; and whether it is the practice of the Department to call for explanations from its servants respecting charges made by anonymous accusers.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) Two complaints were received, one of which was not anonymous. I do not see any impropriety in the course adopted on the occasion to which the hon. Member refers.

Payment of Income Tax by British Subjects Serving Abroad.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what would be the approximate loss to the Revenue if naval and marine officers ceased to pay income-tax on their professional pay when serving abroad; and whether he can state what other classes of the community pay income-tax to the Mother Country on pay and private incomes when stationed in parts where the cost of living is enhanced by protective tariffs.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The information which my hon. and gallant friend asks for could only be obtained by an exhaustive analysis of the Navy pay sheets, involving considerable labour. All classes of the community when resident abroad are subject to income-tax upon income derived from the public revenues or from investments in the United Kingdom, without regard to the system of taxation prevailing in the particular country in which they may happen to reside; and there seems to me to be no reason why officers of the Navy should be made exempt from this rule.

TELEGRAPH (MONEY) BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), further considered.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) said he gathered that the Postmaster-General was willing to accept an Amendment to Clause 1, of which notice had been given by the hon. Member for Lambeth. He therefore begged to move.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

In page 1, line 12, to leave out the words The Telegraph Acts, 1863 to 1903,' and insert the words 'developing the telephonic system aforesaid.'"—(*Mr. Harold Cox.*)

Amendment agreed to.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) moved an Amendment providing that the Estimates sanctioned by the Treasury for the sum annually required must be laid upon the Table of the House of Commons for thirty days. He said the object of his Amendment was to afford the House of Commons effective control over this expenditure. As the Bill was framed the only control over this expenditure of £6,000,000, would be the control of the Treasury, and he desired that in addition to that, the House of Commons should have some means of ascertaining what sum was going to be expended and how it was to be spent. He therefore thought it would be reasonable to allow the Estimates which had been sanctioned by the Treasury to appear for a short time upon the Table of the House of Commons. The right hon. Gentleman would probably agree with him that there was not much involved in conceding the Amendment, because, unless there was very strong feeling against the proposals of the Post Office, it would not hamper the proceedings of that Department, and it was only in the event of any expenditure which created any objection or against which there was any prejudice that any action would be taken. The Amendment would, however, preserve to the House of Commons at the last moment the right to require some explanation, and he trusted the Postmaster-General would accept it.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.) seconded, and said he considered that in view of the expenditure of large sums of money the Amendment only contained a fair and reasonable proposal, because it would secure adequate control by the House. They were entitled to protest against the growing tendency of Governments to disregard the authority of the House in regard to expenditure. If the Government would not accept an Amendment of this kind the House of Commons might as well be dissolved and the Cabinet put in charge of all these matters.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 13, after the word 'Treasury' to insert the words 'and after such

Estimates have been laid upon the Table of the the House for thirty days.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) hoped the Postmaster-General would accede to this request. The proposal contained in the Bill was a novel one and previous applications for money made by the Post Office in this respect had not gone beyond £4,000,000. Now it was proposed to give them £6,000,000 by a somewhat rough and ready procedure. The proposal of the hon. Baronet was that the House should have the power of criticising the action of the Government, but as the matter stood now they did not know whether or when they would have an opportunity of discussing the Estimate. The enormous figures involved in the Education Vote had not been debated except for a very few minutes this year; and even then the Minister in charge of the Vote did not condescend to explain matters. He was certain that every Member of the House would watch with jealousy the increasing power of the Executive, because the House of Commons was rapidly losing that power of control which was an important part of our Parliamentary history and tradition. As an old Member of the House he urged that this tendency should be resisted by every possible means.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said he could not accept the Amendment for the reason that it was quite a new proposal with regard to a Loan Bill. The House had endorsed the view of the Government that there should be this loan of £6,000,000 for telephone purposes, and that being so the discretion in regard to the expenditure must necessarily remain with the Post Office and the Treasury. He had already given an assurance that the money would be spent only for the extension of the telephone system, and that the expenditure in any one year would probably not exceed £1,500,000. It would be quite impossible to carry out the expenditure of the loan under the conditions proposed by the hon. Baronet. Such a proposal would, when the House was out of session, hang up for six months necessary expenditure. The Post Office could never tell what was the particular expenditure required at a particular moment, and if the expenditure was liable to cease for half a year when the House was not sitting, they would not be able to increase and carry on properly the telephone system for the convenience of the public. In any case it appeared to him that, when they had to deal with a Bill of this sort, the expenditure of the money must be left to the discretion of the Minister in charge of the Department, and when money was required to carry out telephone works it should be at once available. He had assured the House that these moneys would be properly expended, and for the reason he had given he could not accept the Amendment.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) said he had listened with some surprise to the Postmaster-General, who had said they could never tell what the amount of expenditure was going to be. Why could not they tell the precise amount?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON remarked that what he had said was that many of the items of expenditure could not be anticipated, and, if the House was not sitting, under the Amendment the money could not be obtained. Therefore, during the time the House was not sitting the telephone service might be defective.

LORD BALCARRES said that what he wanted to draw the particular attention of the House to was the extraordinary divergence between the policy as to this telephone loan and the policy of the right hon. Gentleman's colleagues in respect to loans for naval and military works proposed by the Government during the last Parliament. It was a permanent source of complaint against the last two Governments that large sums of money were obtained by loan for naval and military works. When the present Chancellor of the Exchequer assumed office he, with the assent of the naval and military authorities, announced his intention of not continuing that system of loans. The money spent by means of loans on naval and military works was in his judgment precisely analogous to the money to be spent under this Bill for telephone works. The naval and military works expenditure now appeared on the Estimates, whereas the telephone works expenditure was raised under a statute. Would the right hon. Gentleman tell them what was the distinction?

*Mr. SPEAKER said that that did not seem to him to be relevant to this Amendment, but only to the Bill as a whole.

Lord BALCARRES apologised for having dropped into a Second Reading argument. He thought the Estimates for telephone works should be laid on the Table of the House, and he wanted to know why the right hon. Gentleman would not do for telephone works what the other Departments did for naval and military works. There was an analogy between the two cases, but in this case the Postmaster-General departed from what had been laid down as necessary for financial security and had not met the Amendment in any way. He could not understand why the right hon. Gentleman was afraid of discussion of Estimates by the House of Commons. If the right hon. Gentleman put too much in his Estimate for any one year, the money was handed back to the Treasury and in the ordinary course of events would be recredited to his Department for telephone purposes. If he spent more money than was authorised by the Estimate it was a commonplace to say that the Treasury would provide the necessary money and see that the expenditure was properly authorised later on. As he had said, the right hon. Gentleman and his colleagues disliked the discussion of Estimates in the House, and it was quite clear that there would be fewer days allotted to Supply in this session than in any session during the last twenty years. He objected most strongly to giving a Department power to spend enormous sums of money and to the withdrawal of the control of the House over those sums. The House of Commons should have some power of revising telephone expenditure and the rates charged for telephone services. It would under this proposal be impossible to have regular and systematic discussions on the subject. The discretion, the Postmaster-General said, must rest with the Post Office, but he differed from that proposition, and he objected in regard to these gigantic loans that the House of Commons should be superseded by the Treasury and the Post Office.

Mr. HAROLD COX hoped the Postmaster-General would think over his objection to accept this Amendment, which was a perfectly reasonable one. If the right hon. Gentleman had accepted his Amendment to reduce the sum of £6,000,000 to £3,000,000 he would not have pressed this point, because in two years they would have had the power of revising the expenditure; but the right hon. Gentleman had taken power to spend £6,000,000 and to take it out of the control of Parliament for four years at least. That was a proposal against which they protested. They had always protested against the Loan Bills of the last Government, but now the right hon. Gentleman was doing the same thing. Why could not the right hon. Gentleman lay his Estimate before the House? The House would not assent to such a course as this in the case of the Army and Navy, in which larger sums were dealt with, and he did not see why the Postmaster-General should not put on paper how he proposed to spend each year £1,500,000 of the loan and lay it before Parliament during the session. As far as he could see, there would be no public control over this expenditure, and it would only be a question between the permanent officials of the Treasury and the permanent officials of the Post Office. It was one of the elementary maxims of Liberal finance that there should be popular control over expenditure, and he sincerely trusted the right hon. Gentleman would reconsider his decision.

Mr. WATT (Glasgow, College) also supported the Amendment. He did not think it was asking too much to request the Postmaster-General, when he got £6,000,000 on loan, to lay the Estimates before the House.

*Mr. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) supported the Amendment, as he was sure that the more opportunities were given to the House of Commons for thoroughly discussing and considering such a proposition as that contained in the Bill the more it would be for the advantage of the public service. It seemed to him very strange that upon a proposal of this kind they should have almost absolute silence on the part of Liberal Members of the House. With the exception of the hon.

Member for Preston, who always came to the rescue on these occasions with his well-reasoned speeches, and the hon. Member behind him, nobody had spoken from the benches opposite. The right hon. Gentleman said that if the Amendment were accepted expenditure might be hung up for six months. But for himself he did not think that that was likely to occur. The eminently reasonable proposal of his hon. friend was that the House should for thirty days before the money was parted with have an opportunity of dealing with any proposal to allocate part of this large sum. The delay, therefore, would not exceed thirty days. The House was getting more and more jealous of the dictation and control of the Cabinet in such matters. Why should the Cabinet ask for a blank cheque up to £6,000,000 and claim a free hand to deal with that sum just as they pleased in the case of telephones? If the proposals were laid on the Table the House would have an opportunity of considering them and taking such steps as they considered likely to promote not only the efficiency of the public service, but also the principle of economy, which was one of the alleged grounds for Liberal Members being returned to the House in such overwhelming numbers. The hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London, representing as he did a vast commercial centre, had a special interest in this matter, and he hoped the Postmaster-General would meet the proposal in a manner becoming of his great position. The time was very near when the whole system of telephones would have to be reconsidered; it was doubly important, therefore, that this matter should be discussed, so that when in 1911 the whole system was taken over they should not have to look back on the work that had been done and realise that there had been excessive waste, which there would be if the Amendment was not accepted.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 20; Noes, 107. (Division List No. 291.)

AYES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Balcarres, Lord
Baring, Capt. Hn. G(Winchester)
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C.W.
Cox, Harold
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gretton, John
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Watt, Henry A.

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Frederick Banbury and Mr. T. L. Corbett.

NOES.

Agnew, George William
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Beale, W. P.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Brigg, John
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Buxton, Rt Hn. Sydney Charles
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cheetham. John Frederick
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Corbett, C.H.(Sussex, E.Grinst'd
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dickinson, W.H.(St.Pancras, N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire, N.E.
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hyde, Clarendon
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F.(Accringto
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lupton, Arnold
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk Bg'hs
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
Menzies, Walter
Mooney, J. J.
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Murnaghan, George
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N.(Doncaster
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Malley, William

Parker, James (Halifax)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Richards, T. F. (Wolverhampton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Stanley, Hn. A. Llulph (Chesh.)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax
Wilkie, Alexander
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said the Amendment he now moved was an agreed Amendment put down at the desire of the Grand Committee.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 13, to leave out from the word 'Treasury,' to end of clause, and insert, 'The Treasury may, if they think fit, with a view to provide money for sums so authorised to be issued out of the Consolidated Fund, or for repaying to that Fund all or any part of the sums so issued, borrow by means of terminable annuities, for a term not exceeding twenty years, and all sums so borrowed shall be paid into the Exchequer. The said annuities shall be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament for the service of the Post Office, and, if those moneys are insufficient, shall be charged on and paid out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom or the growing produce thereof, at such times in each year as may be fixed by the Treasury.'"—(*Mr. Sydney Buxton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. HAROLD COX asked for some explanation as to why the right hon. Gentleman had only put down two paragraphs instead of three as agreed in the Committee upstairs.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON was understood to say the other paragraph was already embodied.

SIR F. BANBURY thought that that was so and congratulated the right hon. Gentleman in having taken the course he had, which enabled anyone who read the Bill to see what these Acts were. But he would like to know why the right hon. Gentleman had left out the three lines which came at the end of Subsection 3.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said they were left out because it left the hands of the Treasury free in prescribing these annuities. They were all interdepartmental annuities, and there was some restriction in those words, and, therefore, it had been the practice of the Treasury for some years to omit them in these Bills.

MR. GRETTON (Rutland) said he did not wish to delay the House on these technical points, but he would like to call attention to the fact that this was only another instance, of which there were many in Grand Committee, of the careless drafting of Government Bills. It certainly did not tend to the expeditious conduct of business either in this House or Committees upstairs.

Question put, and negatived.

Proposed words there inserted.

Bill to be read the third time on Monday next.

POST OFFICE SITES BILL (RE-COMMITTED)

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1:—

SIR F. BANBURY moved to omit the provision proposing that Section 133 of the Lands Clauses Act of 1845 should not be incorporated in the Bill. To his mind that was a very reasonable section, and he did not see why, if that section applied to people generally, it should not also apply to the Post Office. He had no objection to compulsory powers being given to the Post Office to acquire new sites, but he thought the Committee had a right to say that those compulsory powers should be administered in a just way, and that no advantage should be given to the Post Office that was not enjoyed by other people who desired to acquire land by purchase.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 11, to leave out from the word 'Act,' to the word 'shall,' in line 13."—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said there was no intention by the incorporation of the words proposed to be left out to limit the effect of the Lands Clauses Act. This was merely a question of land tax and poor rate. As the hon. Gentleman was aware, the Government, although not assessed, made a contribution to the poor rate. So far as the land tax was concerned there was no desire to avoid that. When the State had taken over this land with the existing liability for land tax it was proposed to redeem the land tax, because the payment of a tax by one Government Department to another only led to unnecessary book-keeping. There was nothing behind it, and the omission had been a common thing in all these Bills for years past.

MR. T. L. CORBETT thought that in a technical matter of this sort the Committee ought to have the assistance of the law officers of the Crown before proceeding further in the discussion. He appealed to the Attorney-General to give the Committee the benefit of his assistance.

MR. GRETTON said he did not quite follow the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman for the inclusion of these words in this particular clause. He hoped the hon. Baronet would proceed to a division.

SIR F. BANBURY said the explanation as to the land tax was more or less satisfactory, but one difficulty was bound to arise, namely, that this method would prevent their getting proper accounts from the Post Office. He was inclined to think the payment of this small amount of land tax by one Department to another might give unnecessary trouble, but he would like to have the opinion of the Attorney-General upon it, as it was rather an important point. He would point out that while the property was being acquired the poor rate was still to be paid, and he wished to know whether that was paid by the Post Office or by the vendor or landlord.

LORD BALCARRES said the Postmaster-General settled the contribution to be paid in respect of the rates by Section 133 of the Act of 1845. Composition in lieu of rates he knew existed, because there was a regular Vote on the subject brought before Parliament. But the local authorities who received these sums would much rather have the poor rate assessment on Government buildings than this contribution, and he would like an assurance that the local authorities would not suffer by this sub-section. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman could give an assurance which would satisfy the local authorities that the income for the rates would not be prejudiced.

*THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir JOHN WALTON, Leeds, S.) said the Crown was not liable to be taxed or rated. They, however, made a voluntary contribution in aid. With regard to the poor rate, the Treasury negotiated with the representatives of the union to which the rates were payable, and arrived at a sum which it was thought fair to contribute in lieu of a parochial assessment. That was, he believed, the practice which had now obtained in regard to all public buildings for a number of years.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 5 agreed to.

Clause 6 :—

SIR F. BANBURY moved to omit Subsection (1)—

"The Postmaster-General may divert, alter and stop up any street, roadway, or passage within the limits of any land shown on the deposited plans, so soon as such lands are acquired by him."

That seemed to him to be an extremely arbitrary provision. In times gone by a great deal of injustice had been done by stopping rights of way all over the country; and there had been a great movement in later years to prevent roadways being blocked up. No one had been more assiduous in supporting movements in this direction than hon. Gentlemen below the gangway, and yet their own Government were now asking for power to divert or stop rights of way. He could not conceive that they would support such a clause, nor that a proposition involving such a policy would be allowed to go through Parliament in any Bill whatever. It must be remembered that this Bill did not apply to sites in rural districts or country places; it applied to London, Chester, Bournemouth, Eastbourne, and Dublin. When they took these towns one saw what a tremendous power this clause gave, and it seemed to him absurd that in a democratic House of Commons the right hon. Gentleman should propose such a clause for acceptance. Even if the clause was to operate only for a certain time he would not accept it; but, for all time the Postmaster-General of the day was to have power to divert or stop rights of way. Why should they give the right hon. Gentleman such a power? There seemed to be an idea that an official had some prescriptive right to do what nobody else was allowed to do. That was not his idea of the manner in which the affairs of the country ought to be conducted. Therefore he moved the omission of the subsection and he hoped he would have the support of hon. Gentlemen below the gangway in his endeavour to secure the rights of the people.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 30, to leave out Subsection 1."—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

*MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said he hoped, as on the previous Amendment, that the hon. Baronet would be persuaded to withdraw his proposal. The position was this, that if there was a well known right of way over a site acquired, it was put into the Bill, so that the House might have an opportunity of considering whether the Crown ought to be allowed to block a well-known and recognised right of way. In the process of building there was nothing to prevent anyone complaining if a right of way was interfered with. But this provision was inserted to guard against contingencies which might involve years of litigation. There was no desire whatever on the part of the Post Office to stop recognised rights of way without compensation, and he entirely sympathised with what the hon. Baronet had said in that regard. It was necessary, however, to have some provision of this sort in order to prevent proceedings being undertaken probably by some cantankerous person.

LORD BALCARRES said in this matter the Postmaster-General seemed to be afraid of some cantankerous individual, but whether he was cantankerous or not he had the right to protest against any right of way being shut up. What was the use of the Postmaster-General's promise to consider the matter, or his guarantee? They did not want that, because when the Bill was passed the right hon. Gentleman would have no power, and no amount of consideration by the right hon. Gentleman could affect the question. It had been said that if in the opinion of the Post Office there had been any rights of way they would have been shown in the schedule. He knew of one instance, at least, where such rights did exist. He could not understand why the right hon. Gentleman in one breath assured the House of his sympathy in maintaining such rights and in the next breath put into a Bill a clause which gave the Government power to close up all these rights of way. He could not understand why the right hon. Gentleman should be desirous of taking powers to override these public privileges. The opposition to the Amendment had been put upon a wrong basis when it was argued that it would cause delay in the erection of a public building. Of course it would, and delay would be quite right if a public right was being destroyed. Unless more solid reasons were given for maintaining this clause he should support the Amendment if it was pressed to a division.

*MR. CLAVELL SALTER (Hampshire, Basingstoke) said it appeared to him from the statement made by the Postmaster-General that the words of this clause were exceedingly ill-chosen. If the only desire was that no cantankerous individual should be heard why was it necessary to give the Postmaster-General power to divert, alter, and stop up any street? Upon the arguments of the right hon. Gentleman alone this subsection was either superfluous or oppressive. Either these public rights of way existed or they did not. He objected to these general powers being given to the Postmaster-General. Should it be necessary to stop up public rights of way, let it be done in each case by Act of Parliament after a public inquiry. If that were done the public could come forward and establish the right of the King's subjects to pass down a certain passage or street; but the effect of passing this subsection would be that the right hon. Gentleman would have power by statute to do away with any such public rights. Parliament had always been exceedingly jealous about public rights of way. He protested against granting the Postmaster-General any powers to shut up public highways which might or might not exist. When they shut up the rights of way belonging to a private individual there was not the same danger, because he could recover compensation, but they could not compensate the public for the loss of such rights. He hoped this question would be very seriously considered, because it raised a question of principle of great importance.

MR. T. L. CORBETT said the Government had seriously encroached upon the rights of the House of Commons. By this arbitrary and tyrannical clause they proposed to encroach upon the rights of the people themselves. They had been told that these words were put into the Bill to secure the position of this Department during building operations, but there was not one word about building operations in the clause.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON pointed out that the clause appeared in previous Sites Bills passed by the late Unionist Government. It was intended for the protection of the Crown, and would not, of course, be used in a tyrannical manner. It was absolutely necessary that the clause should be retained.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth) said that post offices were generally erected at central places where time was of the greatest value, and it was not desirable that under the powers proposed to be taken short cuts and rights of way should be closed, and inconvenience thereby caused to the public. He had in his mind a short cut into Lombard Street in the City which was used every day by thousands of people. If the Post Office authorities bought the land on the other side of that narrow passage and put up buildings, that way would be closed, and a large number of people would have to go round about. That was one of the reasons why the Post Office should not be granted these extraordinary powers. Where streets or rights of way were acquired, and gas mains and electric cables interfered with, compensation would have to be paid, but even when compensation had been paid the disturbing of their arrangements in densely populated parts might be a very serious matter to the companies, and therefore the Committee should take the greatest care in granting powers to the Post Office.

MR. CARLILE said that Southgate, between Middlesex and Hertfordshire, was one of the districts which would be affected by the subsection. As the representative of the district he protested against this arbitrary clause. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that it was in other Bills in regard to sites; but that was no reason for retaining it here. If injustice had been done before, that was a reason why the same form of injustice should not be continued now. The right hon. Gentleman had argued for the retention of the subsection on the ground that it would not be administered in an arbitrary way. But the right hon. Gentleman would not always be the head of the Post Office, and the administration of the Bill, when it became law, might fall to others who would act in an arbitrary way. It was not unreasonable, therefore, to ask that the subsection should be removed. Why did not the right hon. Gentleman meet the hon. Baronet who moved the Amendment by agreeing to a modification which would limit the operation of the subsection to a certain period? If the Postmaster-General would agree to lay a schedule on the Table, they would really know what they were doing. He objected to the interests of districts like Southgate being handed over to any hard-hearted Minister who might occupy the position which the right hon. Gentleman held now.

SIR F. BANBURY said he accepted the statement of the right hon. Gentleman that what was now proposed had been done on previous occasions by the Party to which he had the honour to belong. He would point out, however, that it had been done by means of a schedule. Every Party made mistakes, and if his Party had done something with which he disagreed, that was no reason why he should assent to a similar wrong being done now. It was no answer to say, as the right hon. Gentleman had done, that because the Unionist Party did something it must be right. The argument generally advanced on the other side of the House was that because the Unionist Government had done something it must, therefore, be wrong. He once more appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to accept the Amendment. He did not think that officials, however efficient they might be, should be entrusted with the powers asked under this Bill.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 153; Noes, 26. (Division List No. 292.)

AYES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.
Beale, W. P.
Bennett, E. N.
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brigg, John
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Donelan, Captain A.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
Maddison, Frederick
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Mooney, J. J.
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Murnaghan, George
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Rose, Charles Day
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Seddon, J.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.

Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walton, Sir John L.(Leeds,S.)
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White,Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anstruther-Gray, Major
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cavendish,Rt.Hn. Victor C. W.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Helmsley, Viscount
Pease,HerbertPike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Gretton and Mr. Liddell.

MR. GRETTON (Rutland) moved to omit Subsection (2). The right hon. Gentleman had stated that he thought there were no rights of way over the sites scheduled in the Bill, but he happened to be one of the governors of Christ's Hospital, one of the sites included in the Bill, and so far as he knew it had always been the opinion of the governors that there were certain rights of way over that property which were used by the public, as well as one or two private rights of user. It therefore appeared that the matter was one which required some further investigation. Another point raised by the subsection was the question of pipes and drains affecting general rights of easement. It was a serious thing to do away with old rights of easement. In the two following subsections the Postmaster-General took power to regrant them or to make payments, but it was entirely within his discretion, and whilst they, of course, had entire confidence in the present occupant of the office, it was not reasonable to trust entirely to a public official. These matters would really have to be dealt with by the Post Office officials, for they would never specially come before the Postmaster-General unless some serious objection was raised, and there was a very serious objection to granting to public officials the right to stop up and divert pipes, sewers, and drains connected with important and complicated sites, particularly in the City of London. Legal opinion was really very little better than lay opinion, so diverse had been the decisions of different Judges. This confiscation of the rights of easement included the rights of light and air — a very important matter in a congested place like the City of London. The buildings which might be erected under the subsection would seriously affect large and considerable sums. It therefore appeared to him that these powers should not be granted to the Postmaster-General unless he could give some further and more satisfactory explanation as to why he required them, and particularly the power to stop up rights of ways.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 34, to leave out Subsection (2)."—(*Mr. Gretton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said the subsection was inserted in the Bill so that the Crown should have the right of seeing that the public interest in the purchase of the sites and in the buildings to be erected upon them was not jeopardised. There was no intention of dealing harshly with the questions of easement and other rights. The clause was one which appeared in all previous Acts, and it was really necessary for the effective purchase and the carrying out of these public buildings. He hoped under these circumstances the hon. Gentleman would not press the Amendment.

MR. FORSTER (Kent, Sevenoaks) said there was one question which the right hon. Gentleman had not dealt with, and that was the question of the rights of way, in regard to which his hon. friend had raised the specific case of the Christ's Hospital site. Would the right hon. Gentleman tell them what he proposed to do in reference to that particular site?

*Mr. CLAVELL SALTER (Hants, Basingstoke) said he should not be disposed to support the Amendment if it objected to the acquisition by the Postmaster-General of private rights of way, but the subsection was extremely ambiguous. It proposed to vest in the Postmaster-General private and public rights. What public right would become vested in him under the subsection? Perhaps he would also tell them to whom compensation would be paid for the acquisition of public rights.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON said there might be some rights in the possession of some local authority, but he did not anticipate that any question of compensation would arise.

Mr. FELL said he supposed the Postmaster-General would have to undertake the upkeep of the sewers and drains which he acquired and thus relieve the local authorities. It was perfectly true the present Postmaster-General was exceedingly conciliatory, and would doubtless do everything possible to make things work smoothly, but there had been Postmasters-General in the past who had not been very conciliatory. In many cases rights as regarded light and air were affected by the immense height of post office buildings, and while they would always be disposed to trust the present Postmaster-General, they might not always have him in office. He thought, therefore, they ought to secure these rights in the future. He also asked what would become of the drains under the roads affected.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON thought the hon. Member was pretty safe, for although the tenure of office of the Government was no doubt very precarious according to hon. Gentlemen opposite, still he considered that they would remain in office a few months longer, and there was still a large number of Members of the Opposition to look after them. Various public authorities had considerable interest in drains, and he did not think the hon. Gentleman could anticipate that the Post Office would do anything to interfere with the rights of the public.

Sir F. BANBURY said the only question in which his constituents were interested was that of light, and the difficulties in regard to it arose from the height of Post Office buildings. It was a very serious thing in the City of London if the rights in regard to light were to be taken away. He asked what powers there were in regard to the right to light in the City of London. The question was most important, because, the City not being a residential quarter, if there was not sufficient light the deprivation rendered offices valueless.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON quite agreed, and said the Post Office had been in communication with the Corporation of London in regard to the rights of light, and he did not think there would be any difficulty in regard to that matter.

Mr. GRETTON said that having regard to what had taken place he did not think it wise to press this Amendment to a division. He thought that this was a Bill which might have been referred to a Committee upstairs, as it was very suitable for investigation by a Private Bill Committee.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON said the Bill had already been before a Committee upstairs. It occupied the very exceptional position that it had gone to a Committee upstairs and then to a Committee of this House. It would then go to the House of Lords where it would be examined again in detail.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 7:—

Mr. GRETTON said he did not want to move the rejection of the clause, but he wanted to know why the rights and jurisdiction of the London County Council and of the citizens of London were specially preserved under the Bill, while no powers were taken to preserve the rights of the citizens of Middlesex, Hertford, and Northampton.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON replied that in the case of the borough councils their rights were preserved, and as far as he recollected the right of county councils outside London were also preserved.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 8 and 9 agreed to.

Clause 10:—

SIR F. BANBURY moved the omission of Subsection (2). Subsection (1) was an extremely good subsection. It provided that no purchase should be made by the Postmaster-General under the authority of this Act without the sanction of the Treasury. That was a most excellent subsection, and one of which all on that side of the House would approve. He was sorry to say, however, that the next subsection of which he was moving the omission absolutely contradicted it, because it said that any such sanction might be given either generally or in respect of any particular purchase. The meaning of that as he read it was that the Postmaster-General might go to the Treasury, and exercising his blandishments over the Secretary to the Treasury, or the Chancellor of the Exchequer, get him to agree to give him any powers which he desired. Supposing the Postmaster-General said that he wanted £20,000, the Treasury might say that was a reasonable sum, and grant it; but unless this particular subsection was omitted it appeared to him that any sum of money might be given by the Post Office for any particular site for a post office. If the Committee were going to enact that sort of thing they might as well leave out the clause altogether, and not require the Post Office to ask for the sanction of the Treasury. If the sanction of the Treasury was to be of any use it should have some reality, and he did not see any point in this subsection unless it was intended to deceive the House. He did not think that was intended by the right hon. Gentleman, but it seemed to him that it destroyed the effect of the clause. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 10, to leave out Subsection (2)."—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said the only object of the subsection was to secure that the application of the ratepayers' money should be safeguarded by Treasury sanction being obtained. If the hon. Gentleman had to do what he had had the honour of doing for the last eighteen months, he would know that the Treasury were not open to any blandishments. He might take it that this subsection would not be used in a manner in any way detrimental to the taxpayer. Its only object was to give elasticity to the working of the clause.

MR. FELL thought that the hon. Baronet's proposal would safeguard the public from any general sanction being obtained from the Treasury in order to enable the Post Office to make general purchases in the course of the year. To give the Postmaster-General a general power was to give him an authority which was extremely great, and he thought the right hon. Gentleman should be compelled to go to the Treasury and give them particulars of what he wanted. He suggested the omission of the word "generally."

SIR F. BANBURY did not think that the omission of the word "generally" would have the effect he desired.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 164; Noes, 25. (Division List No. 293.)

AYES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N
Beale, W. P.
Bennett, E. N.
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Burns, Rt. Hn. John
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.

Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Stephen Lambeth,
Collins Sir Wm. J.(S.Pancras W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, CH(Sussex, E Grinst'd
Crean, Eugene
Crooks, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras N
Donelan, Captain A.
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt Hn Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N E.
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelly, George D.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lundon, W
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeigh Charles (Donegal, E)
McKenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
McKillop, W.
Maddison, Frederick
Markham, Arthur Basil
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Murnaghan, George
Murray, James
Myers, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, Willliam (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rose, Charles Day
Rutherford, J. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Seddon, J.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt Hn E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carm'rthn
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Balcarres, Lord
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gretton, John
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Liddell, Henry
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Pease Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Frederick Banbury and Mr. Fell.

Clauses 10 and 11 agreed to.

On the Question that the Bill be reported without Amendment to the House,

SIR F. BANBURY said he did not wish to divide the House on the Question which had been put from the Chair, but he wanted to express the regret which was felt on that side of the House at the refusal of the Postmaster-General to accept the Amendments which they had moved in the most conciliatory manner. They had done their best to facilitate and to assist the passage of the Bill through the House, and he thought they might have been met by the right hon. Gentleman on the very small but important Amendments which they had proposed. If they had been accepted they would not have interfered with the carrying out of the Bill or with its object. Of course, the measure would have to be considered on another stage, but then he supposed in all probability nothing would be done to meet them. With regard to the Bill itself——

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said that the only Question before the House was the Motion to report the Bill without amendment to the House, and the hon. Member was not in order in rediscussing the Bill.

SIR F. BANBURY asked whether it was not in order on the Motion to report the Bill to express an opinion on the Bill itself.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said it would not be in order. It would only be in order to ask a question, or to give some special reason why the Bill should not be reported.

Bill reported without Amendment.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

SIR F. BANBURY said it would now be in order to put forward the arguments he had attempted to address to the Committee a few moments previously. He regretted very much that the Amendment moved on Clause 6 was not accepted, because he thought it was wrong that public rights of way should not be safeguarded on the usual lines. At the present time attempts were being made to alter the law with regard to public rights of way and to make it more difficult than at present to abolish them. He did not see why a Government Department without recourse to law should be allowed to close streets and public roadways in the way proposed by this Bill.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

———

CRIMINAL APPEAL BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

*MR. CLAVELL SALTER moved a new clause with regard to the summary determination of appeals, and he earnestly hoped the Government would favourably consider it. It was a clause which he thought would have a practical bearing in making the new Court more flexible and convenient and less cumbrous and expensive. Some Members had voted against a Court of Criminal Appeal, but the House having decided that there should be such a Court, those who had voted against it now only desired to make it as convenient and successful as possible. It was no doubt necessary that these criminal appeals should be left in the discretion of the Court of Appeal, but at the same time there could be no doubt that the necessity for two separate hearings in the case of every criminal appeal would add greatly to the total expense and delay. The person convicted would have to go through two proceedings for redress. He would first of all have to go to the Court of Appeal for leave to appeal, and the appeal if allowed would be heard some time later. The Court would be working from two lists—one, a long list, for leave to appeal, and the other, a shorter list, dealing with the appeals themselves. Power was given under this Bill to make the application for leave to appeal to a single member of the Court sitting in Chambers for that purpose. If the Judge refused leave, then the person convicted was entitled to have his application reheard in full Court Such an appeal would be a long one if a man came before the Court and said his sentence was excessive, and still longer if he said his sentence was unjust. Counsel would refer to voluminous shorthand notes and the appeal would take the greater part of the day, at any rate it would be a long and costly business. Let the House imagine what would happen. A man appealed against his sentence on the ground that it was excessive. Counsel for both sides would come before the Court. Counsel for the convicted man would allege that his client had received an excessive sentence. He would then go through the history of the case, which would take some time, and then it would be the novel, invidious, and repulsive duty of the opposing counsel to insist upon the adequacy of the sentence and to call attention to all the matters he could to aggravate the case. After an hour or two of the time of the

Court had been taken up, the Judges, it might be, would come to the conclusion that the sentence was excessive. Under those circumstances the Court had only one course to pursue—namely, to state to the counsel for the convicted man that he had made out a *prima facie* case and give the man leave to appeal against the sentence, in which case the counsel would come back in about two months time and go through the matter all over again. The object of the clause he now moved was to give the Court the right to say in such a case, "Not only do we give you leave to appeal, but we shall treat this application for leave as the substantive appeal." The Court which had come to the conclusion that the sentence was excessive would obviously have come to a conclusion as to what sentence ought to be given, and all this clause did was to give them power to dispose of the whole thing at once. In that way he thought that the clause would operate with great public convenience and save expenditure. It would also operate in the case of appeals against the conviction on the ground that it was unjust. In that case if the Court came to the conclusion that the sentence was not satisfactory, it would be a great convenience to allow them to say so and to order the case to be tried again at the next Assizes. He begged to move.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University) seconded the new clause. He said it was an unfortunate feature of this Bill that all its stages had been taken at morning sittings, although the Attorney-General had been understood to say that the Report stage should not be taken at a morning sitting.

SIR JOHN WALTON said that he promised to do his best to consider the convenience of Members belonging to the legal profession. He made representations to those who arranged the business of the House, but it was found impossible to take the Bill at any other time.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that it was unfortunate, seeing how this Bill interested the members of the legal profession, who were unable to be present at morning sittings. To that extent the House was deprived of the full criticism which such a Bill as this ought to receive. He believed that the Attorney-General had under-estimated the amount of business that would be thrown on the Court of Appeal, owing to the large number of very small cases that would be brought forward. He appeared to assume that only large cases involving novel or great questions of criminal law or unusual questions of fact would come before this Court, but criminals of every sort would appeal against sentences, especially as the cost would be provided for them. In a great number of the cases which came before the Court the appeal might be allowed after full inquiry, and then the matter might be postponed for two or three months and have to be gone into all over again. Surely in matters of that kind the Judges could be trusted to deal with the cases which could be disposed of at once. Why was it that the Judge was not allowed to have this discretion, especially having regard to the possible block of business arising from the number of cases which would come before the Committee? Then, again, what was to happen in the interval between the leave to appeal given and the time when the appeal took place to the person who was appealing against his conviction and sentence? He hoped if this clause was not accepted some good reason would be given for it.

New clause—

"On the hearing of any application for leave to appeal the Court of Criminal Appeal may, if they think fit, deal with the matter as though such application were an appeal under this Act."—(*Mr. Salter.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

*SIR JOHN WALTON said that his hon. and learned friend was under a slight misapprehension as to the procedure which would be adopted in order to give effect to this portion of the Bill. The motion for leave to appeal would be an *ex parte* motion made by a convicted person. In other words, it was proposed to revive the procedure of obtaining a rule *nisi* for a new trial. The appellant would have to satisfy the Court that there were very substantial grounds for setting aside the verdict, and he would have the advantage of doing that *ex parte* and without the presence of the prosecution. It was important that this step should be made as economical as possible, and unless there was some point proposed to be raised worth arguing it seemed to him to be unnecessary to burden the Exchequer with the cost of briefing counsel for the prosecution in order that they might attend when there was in reality nothing for them to answer. If the Court thought that there was no real ground for the appeal they would dismiss it; if, on the other hand, they felt some difficulty in supporting the conviction they might be glad to hear what the prosecution had to say. In these circumstances the Court would have, where it was necessary, both parties present. Provision was made against frivolous appeals on questions of law only, because if an application for leave to appeal came before the Registrar, and he thought that it was frivolous, he could say that there was no substantial grounds whatever for it, and then a summary determination would be arrived at.

*MR. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston) complained of the inconvenience of such a Bill as this being discussed at a morning sitting and pointed out that it was really impossible for professional men to attend at the House at such a time. He hoped his hon. friend would not insist on this new clause, because if it was the fact that these applications for leave were to be heard *ex parte* it obviously would not be right to dispose of the appeal itself in the way suggested in the clause. If the Court thought it was a vexatious or frivolous appeal they would dispose of it by refusing leave to appeal, but if they thought there was something in the case it would not be right that they should grant relief without hearing counsel for the prosecution and satisfying themselves that the *prima facie* case made upon the application for leave to appeal could be maintained.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said he did not know whether the person applying for leave to appeal would be satisfied with the decision of a Registrar. He thought appellants might insist upon a practice similar to that which existed in one of the High Courts of India, in the Registrar's office of which he had served, namely, to bring the case before a Judge sitting as an admission court whereby real courts, hearings and appeals would result. He had gathered that it would be permissible to some extent to discuss the principle of the Bill on this Amendment. If that were so it would be on Clause 1, Sub-section 1, and for his part he would say that this Bill was unnecessary in so far as it was designed to relieve the Home Secretary of his function of advising in the exercise of the prerogative of mercy. If the Home Secretary asked, as he always did, and followed the advice of the Judge who tried the case, his task and his responsibility would be lightened. It had been his own duty when British Resident at the Courts of Native Princes to exercise this function, and he believed, that upon the advice of the trying Judge it could be properly exercised, and outside pressure avoided or disregarded.

*MR. SPEAKER said the hon. Gentleman had mistaken the question. The question was that the new clause be read a second time, and upon that question the hon. Gentleman could not take the opportunity to discuss the principle of the Bill on Clause 1.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham) moved the adjournment of the debate on the ground that although no one doubted the good faith of the Attorney-General, it was undoubtedly the fact that it was understood by hon. Gentlemen with whom he sat that this stage of the Bill would not be taken at a morning sitting. The Bill was of great importance to the general public and the legal professior There were many legal Gentlemen wh sat on his side of the House unable tc be present. Believing that the Bill was not to be taken, they had made other arrangements. He did not think his hon. and learned friends should be prevented from taking part in the debate owing to an unfortunate misunderstanding. He begged to move.

MR. CARLILE formally seconded the Motion.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the debate be now adjourned."

The House divided:—Ayes, 28; Noes, 173. (Division List No. 294.)

AYES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt. Hn. Victor C.W.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Hardy,Laurence (Kent,Ashf’rd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Liddell, Henry
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Viscount Turnour and Mr. Carlile.

NOES.

Abraham,William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry,Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.
Beale, W. P.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bennett, E. N.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex,Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brunner,J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst’d
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crooks, William
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Donelan, Captain A.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Flynn, James Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Halpin, J.
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey,W.E.(Derbyshire, N.E.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jenkins, J.
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down,S.)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M‘Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M‘Killop, W.
Maddison, Frederick
Markham, Arthur Basil
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Mooney, J. J.
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast’r)
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O’Brien,Kendal (TipperaryMid
O’Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O’Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O’Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O’Grady, J.
O’Malley, William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S’thampton)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C.E. (Edinb’gh,Central)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh’mpt’n)
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradf’rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Seddon, J.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim,S.)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)

Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay, T.
Wason, Rt Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carm'rth'n
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Original Question put, and negatived.

*MR. CAVE said he desired to move the new clause standing in his name to postpone the operation of the Bill until not less than three additional Judges had been appointed to the King's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice.

*SIR JOHN WALTON asked whether it was in order to move to postpone the operation of an Act without stating a definite period in which it should come into force.

MR. SPEAKER said he could not say it was out of order; he thought the hon. Gentleman was entitled to move.

*MR. CAVE said that if it were not in his opinion important he would not press it. They were all agreed that the King's Bench Division was undermanned, and although the House had agreed last week to the appointment of one new Judge, everyone admitted that that was not enough for the work the Division now had to do. This Bill would add a very large amount of work. There were some 12,000 convictions on indictment in the course of a year, and the probable number of appeals could not be put at less than 2,000 or 3,000. In order to hear those appeals at least three Judges would have to be taken away from their ordinary work for the greater part of the year, and no provision had been made for that contingency. He submitted that before the Bill came into operation some provision should be made to cope with this additional work, and he hoped that the hon. and learned Gentleman would tell the House how it was proposed to cope with it. Unless he had some definite promise that something would be done to meet this obvious need he should press his Motion.

SIR F. BANBURY seconded the Amendment. He was perfectly sure that his hon. friend would not desire the appointment of three additional Judges unless their appointment was necessary. He was anxious, if they were to have a new Court of Appeal, to get that Court properly conducted. A short time ago there were not enough Judges to carry on the ordinary business, and if they were to have a new Court it would appear to be necessary to have additional Judges.

New clause—

"Notwithstanding anything herein contained this Act shall not take effect unless and until an Act shall have been passed authorising the appointment by His Majesty of not less than three additional Judges of the King's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice."—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

*SIR JOHN WALTON said it was difficult at this stage to fix the number of Judges, as they did not know what would be the result of this legislation, whether the appeals by prisoners would be few or many; they could not anticipate with any degree of certainty one way or the other. Further, it could not be seen to what extent it would be necessary to increase the judicial staff until a redistribution of the business of the Courts had been effected in the King's Bench Division and the Court of Appeal. A committee was now considering the subject, and it was quite possible that a portion of the business of the King's Bench would be transferred to a third division of the Court of Appeal. If that change should be effected, the existing staff of the King's Bench Division should be able to undertake the work which would be created if this legislation were carried. In these circumstances he thought it was impossible to do more than to ask the House to content themselves for the present with the appointment of one additional Judge.

MR. CARLILE, speaking with afl diffidence as a layman, said the Attorney-General had told them distinctly the other day that the average of arrears when the Courts rose for the Long Vacation was at least 600 cases, and he did not see how the transference of work from one Court to another would diminish arrears—especially when the Court of Criminal Appeal was established—without an increase of the number of Judges. The Attorney-General had recently proposed the appointment of one additional Judge, but there was a division of opinion as to whether the number ought not to be three, in view of the great glut of work already existing, and the increase of work which must be caused by the Court of Criminal Appeal.

MR. F. E. SMITH (Liverpool, Walton) pointed out that if the clause were adopted the Government would be deprived of the opportunity of judging what addition to the judicial staff would be rendered necessary by the establishment of a Court of Criminal Appeal. What the Government wished to ascertain was what additions would be necessary after this Bill had come into operation. As he understood, the intention of the Government had been declared unequivocally that such additions would be made to the judicial staff as might be rendered necessary by the state of business after the Court of Criminal Appeal had been established. With that assurance, further discussion would be useless.

Question put, and negatived.

SIR JOHN WALTON moved to leave out the word "seven" and insert the word "eight" in Clause 1. He had, he said, given a pledge in Committee to increase by one the number of Judges on the panel for the proposed Court of Criminal Appeal.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 7, to leave out the word 'seven' and insert the word 'eight.'"—(*Sir John Walton.*)

Sir John Walton.

Question proposed that the word "seven" stand part of the Bill.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he did not think that this proposal was what some of them had contended for in Committee. There were times when a great many Judges would be absent on circuit and it would be extremely difficult and inconvenient to make up the Court if any particular group of Judges was required to sit constantly in London. As they were considerably increasing the business of the Court, and they declined to appoint more than one additional Judge, it would be better to leave the Lord Chief Justice power to draw upon the whole resources of the King's Bench Division, and from time to time to constitute the Court with such Judges as it might be convenient to summon. While the substitution of eight for seven was a great improvement, the Lord Chief Justice making the ninth, and so enabling three Courts to be set up, he thought it would be preferable to accept the Amendment of his hon. friend the Member for the University of Cambridge, to leave it open to the Lord Chief Justice to summon such judges as could be summoned with least inconvenience to the course of public business. He suggested that the Attorney-General should drop the word "eight" and insert the word "the," as proposed by his hon. and learned friend the Member for the University of Cambridge.

*MR. CLAVELL SALTER said the proposal of the Attorney-General was that there should be a panel of eight from which the Lord Chief Justice was to select three Judges for the Court of Criminal Appeal, whereas the Amendment of his hon. and learned friend the Member for Cambridge University was that the Lord Chief Justice should be left free to select three from among any of the King's Bench Judges. They all desired to get the most suitable men for this Court, and they might be very sure that the most suitable men available would always be selected by the Lord Chief Justice. He thought it would be very undesirable to make changes in the composition of the Court, and that it would be most desirable to keep continuity of *personnel.* The Judges appointed to the Court of Criminal Appeal would not be available for circuit work, at any rate for a long time. He thought the hands of the Lord Chief Justice should be left as free as possible in the making of arrangements already difficult to accomplish. It was suggested that some Judges were suitable for one class of work and some for another, but he could not see why a Judge who was fit to go on circuit should not be fit to sit in the Court of Criminal Appeal. But that was a minor matter. The major matter was that the choice of the Lord Chief Justice of Judges for the Criminal Appeal Court should be free and not limited to eight.

Amendment agreed to.

SIR JOHN WALTON moved an Amendment to Subsection (4) of Clause 1, which provides that any question before the Court of Criminal Appeal should be decided by a majority of the Judges, but that there should be only one judgment delivered. The Amendment was to the effect that this provision should be modified where there was a question of law on which it would be convenient that there should be separate judgments by the members of the Court. The Government, he said, had maintained in Committee that the practice of the Privy Council to have no minority judgment should be followed in criminal matters, so that the executive, in the execution of a sentence, should have the full support of the tribunal. It had been pointed out, however, that questions of law might occasionally arise in reference to which it would be desirable to have the view of a minority of the Bench having regard to the possible necessity for further legislation. This argument had convinced him, and he thought it might be consistent with the general rule of the section if an exception were created in those cases referred to in the Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 1, to leave out the word 'and,' and insert '(5) Unless the Court direct to the contrary in cases where, in the opinion of the Court, the question is a question of law on which it would be convenient that separate judgments should be pronounced by the members of the Court.'"—(*Sir John Walton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'and' stand part of the Bill."

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he had a similar Amendment on the Paper, but he thought the Attorney-General's proposal better answered the object he had in view, and they were grateful to the Government for having introduced it. As the Bill was first drafted the practice of the Privy Council was to be followed, and no dissentient judgment pronounced, but the Privy Council had the power, and sometimes under careful restrictions exercised it, of departing from its own previous decisions, or modifying them; that was maintained by very high authority in various decisions. In regard to the Court of Criminal Appeal, if there was a dissentient judgment which might point to the necessity of legislation, it would be unfortunate if the judgment was not reported, and an Amendment made in the criminal law where necessary.

Question put, and negatived.

Proposed words there inserted in the Bill.

*SIR JOHN WALTON next moved to insert a new subsection, "If in any case the prosecutor or defendant obtains the certificate of the Attorney-General that a decision of the Court of Criminal Appeal involves a point of law of exceptional public importance, he may appeal from that decision to the House of Lords, but subject thereto." There were cases of the greatest public importance where questions of law might possible arise in the Court of Criminal Appeal which it should be possible to carry to the highest Court of the realm. He quite recognised the importance of securing finality; yet in the cases in question, in order that the law should be authoritatively laid down, so as to carry the greatest weight, not only in the Empire, but throughout the world, it seemed desirable to make some provision for an appeal. It had occurred to him originally that they should allow appeal by the procedure of writ of error, but they might have an error of law of the greatest magnitude which could not form the subject of a writ of error, because it was not apparent on the face of the proceedings, and, therefore, he had come to the conclusion that the best plan was to do away with the institution of the writ of error and to propose this Amendment. Inasmuch as the appeal would be brought in the public interest, care would be taken that no hardship was suffered by an accused person by reason of the appeal. In cases where strong public feeling was excited and jurists were divided in opinion, it was only the judgment of the highest Court of the realm that would be universally accepted. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 7, at the beginning, to insert the words, 'If in any case the prosecutor or defendant obtains the certificate of the Attorney-General that a decision of the Court of Criminal Appeal involves a point of law of exceptional public importance, he may appeal from that decision to the House of Lords, but subject thereto.'"—(*Sir John Walton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N.W.) thought the House would welcome the Amendment, but he pointed out that this was an entirely new departure with regard to the prerogative of the Attorney-General. It seemed to him that the Court which tried the case and might be divided in opinion upon some very grave point of law should also have power to grant leave to appeal. He suggested that, while reserving his own rights, the Attorney-General should extend those rights to the Court.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON welcomed the Amendment. He did not think it extended the power of the Attorney-General unduly. He understood the object was to limit appeals of this nature to matters of great public importance or juristic interest. This power to give leave to appeal was not inconsistent with other powers which the Attorney-General possessed.

MR. CAVE thought the *fiat* of the Attorney-General was the best course to adopt, because it brought a fresh mind to the subject, and he would carefully read the judgment of the Court in cases of this kind. He thought the Executive officer was the proper person to take the necessary step. He wished to point out that the prosecutor in a criminal case was often only a name. Therefore the Director of Public Prosecutions ought to be able to apply for this certificate. He thought it was quite novel to have an appeal direct from the High Court to the House of Lords. The power of the House of Lords to take the opinion of the Judges still existed, and probably in cases of this kind they would take that course. If this Amendment was adopted it would be necessary to provide that the Director of Public Prosecutions should have charge of the proceedings on the part of the prosecution in the House of Lords.

MR. BEALE (Ayrshire, S.) said it was an old practice to have an appeal straight to the House of Lords, at all events from the First Court in what was then the Court of Chancery. There was no real innovation in the course proposed in this case.

SIR JOHN WALTON said he was prepared to amend the Amendment so as to give the Director of Public Prosecutions, as well as the prosecutor or defendant, power to obtain the certificate. He would move his Amendment in the following altered form:—"If in any case the Director of Public Prosecutions or the prosecutor or defendant obtains the certificate of the Attorney-General that a decision of the Court of Criminal Appeal involves a point of law of exceptional public importance, and that it is desirable in the public interest that an appeal should be brought, he may appeal from that decision to the House of Lords, but subject thereto."

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

MR. BOULTON (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey) moved to insert in Clause 2, after the word "registrar" the words "and deputy registrar." His object was to provide that in the case of the illness or absence of the registrar, the deputy registrar should be able to take his place.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 23, after the word 'registrar' to insert the words 'and deputy registrar.'"—(*Mr. Boulton.*)

The Amendment was not seconded.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 26, to leave out the word 'Supreme' and to insert the words 'King's Bench Division of the High.'"—(*Sir John Walton.*)

Amendment agreed to

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON moved an Amendment to Clause 3 limiting the right of appeal to persons convicted "of an indictable offence other than an indictable offence triable by summary jurisdiction." He reminded the Attorney-General that there were a very large number of cases of indictable offences which were triable on summary jurisdiction, but in which the magistrate had to put before the prisoner the option of being dealt with summarily or sent to trial. It would surely be right that the prisoner should be informed that if he chose to go to quarter sessions or assizes he would have a right of appeal against the conviction and sentence. There was also the right of the prisoner, wherever a court of summary jurisdiction could give a sentence of more than three months imprisonment, to claim to go before a jury and have his case treated as an indictable offence. To allow this great bulk of cases which were now dealt with at the smallest possible expenditure of time to come within the class of cases carrying with them a right to an appeal under this Bill, would overwhelm the Court with work and would bring under the notice of his Majesty's Judges a number of cases which were really unworthy of their consideration. He asked whether an accused person under the circumstances he had described ought not to be informed of the prospect before him if he chose to be tried by quarter sessions. He thought the framers of the Bill had somewhat under-rated the activities of local practitioners. Until the prisoner was convicted, the solicitor would have no particular object in framing the defence with any elaborate subtlety. As soon as the prisoner was convicted there came the opportunity of making out a case for the Court of Appeal. Those who moved in criminal circles, or in the neighbourhood of such circles, were not so particular about truth as one would wish, and if they found after a prisoner had been convicted that certain evidence would have been of value to the prisoner at the trial had it been forthcoming, persons would be found who would not be deterred by their regard for truth from putting the evidence before the Court of Appeal. To allow the great bulk of cases which were now dealt with at the smallest possible expenditure of time, to come within the class of cases carrying with them a right to an appeal under this Bill, would overwhelm the Court with work and would bring under the notice of His Majesty's Judges a number of cases which were really unworthy of their consideration.

MR. CARLILE seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 33, to leave out the words 'on indictment,' and insert the words 'of an indictable offence other than an indictable offence triable by summary jurisdiction.'"—(*Sir Willian Anson*).

Question proposed, "That the words 'on indictment' stand part of the Bill."

SIR JOHN WALTON said the proposal of the hon. Baronet would unduly limit the scope of the Bill. It was not intended to afford any appeal from convictions by summary process. The whole scope of the Bill was to provide an appeal from convictions obtained before a judge, or chairman of quarter sessions, and a jury. It was obvious that a trial before a magistrate or a bench of magistrates was in an entirely different position. There was already a Court of Appeal applicable to such cases. He thought the short answer to this Amendment was that if a case could be tried by a Judge and jury, why should not the result be the subject of appeal? He did not think it would be proper to draw a limiting line such as that proposed, and he hoped his hon. friend would not press the Amendment.

Question put.

The House divided—Ayes, 185; Noes, 37. (Division List No. 295.)

AYES.

Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baring, Godfrey(Isle of Wight
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone,N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bennett, E. N.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.Richard Knight
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness'sh'
Donelan, Captain A.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Flynn, James Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.HnHerbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Halpin, J.
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey,W.E.(Derbyshire, N.E.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazleton, Richard
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E.Hopkinson
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jenkins, J.
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor-(Swansea
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
Maddison, Frederick
Markham, Arthur Basil
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien,Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donuell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel,Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Schwann,Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim,S.)
Soares, Ernest J.
Steadman, W. C.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Walton,Sir John L.(Leeds,S.)
Ward,W.Dudley(Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Wasner,Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,RtHn.E(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley,John Henry(Halifax)
Williams,Llewelyn(Camarth'n
Wilson, Henry J.(York,W.R.)
Wilsou,J. H. (Middlesbrnugh)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Kimber, Sir Henry
Liddell, Henry
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) moved to leave out sub-section (*d*), which extends, with the leave of the Court of Criminal Appeal, the right of appeal on grounds other than those of law—that is to say "on any ground of appeal which involves a question of fact alone, or a question of mixed law and fact, or any other ground which appears to the Court to be a sufficient ground of appeal." He said this sub-section raised the most important question in the Bill. The opponents of the measure had little objection to allowing the right of appeal on questions of law. It was to the unlimited right of appeal on questions of fact which would be set up by this sub-section that the opponents based their objection. He ventured to say that the majority of those who had experience of criminal work—Judges, chairmen of quarter sessions, and lawyers who practised in the criminal courts—had come to the conclusion that the Bill, if passed in its present form, would be absolutely unworkable. In the event of the Government not accepting the Amendment to omit this sub-section, he reserved to himself and his friends the right to move Amendments later on with the view to such modifications being made as would do away with the objection they now had to the sub-section. It was proposed that every prisoner should have the right to apply for leave to appeal on matters of fact as well as of law. If a man brought before a Court, say in Cornwall, pleaded not guilty, and after trial was convicted by the jury, he would be more than human if he did not apply for leave to appeal. If he could get leave to appeal, he would lose nothing. There were reasons why a prisoner's friends should assist him to appeal. In the ordinary case which came before quarter sessions a trial might last a whole day, and a full note of the case was to be taken by a shorthand writer. If the Registrar wanted the transcript, that would involve an expense of £5 or £6. Then the solicitor and counsel who conducted the case at the trial might have the right to appear at the expense of the country when the case came before the Court of Appeal. Therefore, there were persons interested in an appeal being lodged. These observations applied to the man who had been wrongfully convicted, and who probably was justified in taking advantage of every means the law allowed him to vindicate his character. But in the case where a prisoner had been rightly convicted, there would be the same right to ask leave to appeal. If that man was ever to go back into the world again, he would be forced to say "I do not acquiesce in the verdict of the jury, I want to go the Court of Appeal."

The result would be that there would be such a glut of business that the Court of Appeal would not be able to get through it unless the work was done in a perfunctory way. If the work was to be done in a perfunctory way, this Bill would be an absolute farce and delusion. They would have 600, 700, or 800 cases at least coming before the Court of Appeal in one year asking for leave to appeal, and, even if the three Judges sat not less than forty weeks in the year, they would be fully occupied hearing applications. That would make the Bill in its present form a mere delusion, and a farce. Instead of a prisoner getting a better chance, it would be worse for him After he had got leave to appeal, the appeal would have to be heard before the Court, and for the first time in the annals of criminal law they were to have trial by three Judges in substitution for trial by jury. He challenged the Attorney-General to find any precedent for this. Assuming that a jury had convicted a person of one offence, the Court of Appeal could set that sentence aside and find him guilty of another offence of which the jury had not found him guilty. The Court would have power to send for additional evidence, but they could hardly expect them to do so in the majority of cases. This appeal upon facts was said to be for the benefit of the prisoner, but he ventured to submit that it would neither be in his interest nor in the interest of the good administration. of the criminal law. Juries and chairmen of quarter sessions were only human, and, if the Bill were passed, they would know that the final word did not rest with them, and that a prisoner could go to the Court of Appeal; and whereas now they had a keen sense of their responsibility and always gave a prisoner the benefit of any real doubt, they would be inclined to think that if they made a mistake the Judges above would put it right. Of course, a jury would not convict a man simply because he had the right of appeal, but, if they were divided, the fact might change the balance of opinion in favour of his conviction, whilst under the existing law the balance of opinion went in favour of acquittal. He wished to deal with the case of the innocent man wrongly convicted. Such cases were not so frequent as the Press seemed to indicate. He had still confidence in juries at quarter sessions, and he had had considerable opportunity of seeing their work. An innocent man wrongly convicted would apply for leave to appeal, and, if he got it, his case would be heard before three Judges by the same technical rules of evidence as the Court below. Supposing they upheld the conviction, or supposing leave to appeal was refused, he would have power to apply to the Home Secretary. Would not this procedure, however, considerably weaken not only the position of the Home Secretary, but also the chances of the prisoner of receiving money as well as justice at the hands of the Secretary of State? It would be a strong thing if the Secretary of State intervened in a case before the man had exhausted all the proper legal remedies afforded him. Surely it would be practically impossible for the right hon. Gentleman to intervene where a prisoner had not been to the Court of Appeal. The Home Secretary must not for a moment suppose he was going to stop popular clamour, for which purpose the Bill was mainly introduced. Newspaper critics were not so logical that they would be deterred from criticising the judgments of three especially selected Judges. Attempts thus to prevent criticism were unworthy of public officials, and if the meaning of giving this right of appeal was to destroy newspaper criticism he thought it would fail as it ought to fail. A person who administered the criminal law, however humble his position, should do his duty firmly to the best of his ability and be absolutely indifferent to criticism. The same thing applied to the Secretary of State. He ventured to press this point very strongly upon the House, and to ask them to reject the clause in its present form. Instead of doing good it would do harm. It would weaken the responsibility of juries and the position of the Home Secretary, and it would injure the chances of the persons who appealed to him. Furthermore, the Court of Appeal would be unworkable, and would bring discredit instead of credit to the criminal law. The criminal law at present was the one institution which could bear the light and defy criticism, and the proposed unlimited right of appeal on questions of fact was unnecessary, and would tend to injure the administration of justice in the country.

*MR. CAVE seconded the Amendment. He said he had for many years been in the habit of trying prisoners with juries, and he thought with his hon. and learned friend that it was a mistake to give unlimited power of appeal on questions of fact. He had not the least doubt as to the desirability of giving a right of appeal on points of law, and if there had been an appeal on points of law the error which occurred in the Beck case would have been remedied at once. But it was contrary to the opinion of the very great majority of persons who had experience in the criminal law that there should be an unlimited right of appeal on questions of fact. It was opposed by the majority of the Judges, by the late Lord Chief Justice, and by the present Lord Chief Justice in a speech of very great weight made in the other House, and had been referred to with disapproval by Judges in charges to grand juries. One Judge of great distinction had said :—

> "Such of us as have experience of Courts of Appeal on questions of fact in foreign countries know something of the abuses which those Courts create. They are the resort of rogues, who by money and delay trick justice of her due."

When an experienced Judge with all the responsibility of his office used such words as those, he thought the House ought to pause before it lightly made the proposed change. It would be a complete reversal of the criminal system, for it was now proposed for the first time that the verdict of a jury might be set aside by three Judges. He knew that many Members were under the impression that the verdict of a jury in civil cases might be set aside on questions of fact; but they were mistaken. It was only when the verdict was not founded on any evidence or was what was called a perverse verdict—a verdict which no reasonable man would give—that it could be impeached. In criminal cases no such appeal had ever existed, and he thought the proposal was founded on a wrong view of the criminal law. The trial of a man on indictment was not a case where one side was striving for victory over the other; it was really a solemn public inquiry, by a jury drawn from and representing the public, into the question whether the prosecution could prove beyond doubt that the person charged was guilty of the alleged offence. Everything was in favour of the person accused and opposed to the possibility of a wrong conviction. They were going to change all that and to substitute for trial by a jury, trial by three judges, who might, while acquitting a man of the charge upon which he had been tried and convicted, convict him on an altogether different count, and sentence him for an offence for which he had never been tried by a jury. It would be an injustice to convict a man in that way. Apart from that, he considered that there would be some danger in empowering these Judges to acquit a man of an offence of which he had been convicted by a jury. It would be a different thing if power were given to the Judges to order a new trial; but, when a man had been unanimously convicted by a jury who had had him before them and had seen and heard the witnesses, it was undesirable that three Judges, however eminent, should be authorised on the mere perusal of shorthand notes to release him altogether. He had a good deal of admiration for the way in which appeals had been dealt with by the Home Office, but even the Home Office admitted that it was not satisfactory that they should decide upon the case without seeing the witnesses. The same thing applied to the proposed Court of Appeal, and he thought that in the interests of justice the right of that Court should be confined to ordering a new trial. There might be objections even to that course, but the main objection to the present Bill would not apply. He had followed the discussion carefully, and he still held the view that the step which they were asked to take was not in the interests of the administration of justice. It would strike a blow at the present system, and would lead to results which few Members really foresaw.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 1, to leave out paragraph (b) of Clause 3."—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'with the leave of the' stand part of the Bill."

LORD BALCARRES said he was not familiar with the details of the Bill, but he respectfully submitted that the two speeches to which they had listened were of a character to demand some reply, and he begged to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Lord Balcarres*)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C (added in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. Bennett; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. Hedges.

Report to lie upon the Table.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to Standing Order No. 3.

Adjourned at one minute after Five o'clock till Monday next.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 22nd July, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Richmond (Surrey) Electricity Supply Bill; North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments; and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Central London Railway Bill.—Read 3ª, and passed.

North Staffordshire Railway Bill.—The Order made on the 4th instant appointing certain Lords the Select Committee to consider the Bill, discharged.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill—(Dunstable Order).—Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the said Order, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read and ordered to lie on the Table: The Orders made on the 4th instant respecting the commitment of the Bill to a Select Committee in regard to the said Order, discharged.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Killery's Divorce Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Ashton-under-Lyne, Stalybridge, and Dukinfield (District) Waterworks Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments: The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Bude Gas Bill; King's Norton and Northfield Urban District Council Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Longton (Caroline Street Chapel) Charity Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Thursday next (The Lord Weardale). (No. 123.)

Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been read 2ª (The Lord Hamilton of Dalzell), and reported from the Committee; and Bill to be read 3ª on Wednesday the 31st instant. (No. 125.)

Aberdeen Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Read 2ª (according to Order), and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899) deemed to have been reported from the Committee; and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

BOARD OF EDUCATION SCHEME (HULME TRUST ESTATES EDUCATIONAL) CONFIRMATION BILL.

[SECOND READING].

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

*THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, this Bill deals with a very important matter, and I think it is necessary to explain its scope in a very few words. This Trust—the Hulme Trust—is one of a rather rare class of charities, which for many years past has been in the position of those people whom we sometimes hear of in private life, but are seldom fortunate enough to meet, who have more money than they know what to do with. The Hulme Trust is of very long standing; it goes back, I believe, to the year 1691, when William Hulme left some estates in the neighbourhood of Manchester to be held by trustees, the proceeds of those estates to be paid and distributed to and amongst four of the poorest Bachelors of Arts at Brasenose College in certain circumstances. If those four bachelors now enjoyed the income of the Trust they would be among the most enviable members of Oxford University; but, as a matter of fact, even so long ago as the eighteenth century the estates had begun to assume a value which made it necessary to divert part of the funds from their original purpose. A number of private Acts of

Parliament were passed throughout the reign of George III. dealing with the matter, and as the funds went on increasing in value new schemes were made, and at present the Trust is governed by a scheme which was approved by the late Queen in Council in the year 1881. The effect of that scheme is to divide the income, which is now very large and is becoming larger, between Brasenose College and certain objects in Lancashire. The trustees have been paying large sums of £1,000, £1,500, and £2,000 a year to what is known as the Hulme Hall in connection with the Victoria University, to the Owens College, to various grammar schools and high schools, and also a large sum for exhibitions at Brasenose College. Now the time has come, in the opinion of the Board of Education, when it is necessary to make a new scheme. A great many communications have passed between the different interests involved, which were not always quite easy to reconcile, but now an arrangement has been arrived at which, I think, satisfies everybody and certainly satisfies the Board of Education. That scheme, therefore, is scheduled in the Bill, providing for certain payments on the lines of the scheme of 1881 to different educational institutions. Then, after those specified payments are made, the residue is divided into two equal shares, half to Oxford and half to Lancashire. The Oxford share goes, as regards two-thirds, to Brasenose, and one-third to Oxford University; but one of the two-thirds belonging to Brasenose may be, if they approve, applied to objects which interest both the University and the College. The Lancashire half of the residue is applied in equal proportions to University and secondary education in Lancashire. The sum has now reached a very large amount, and I think your Lordships will be disposed to agree that this allocation is a wise one. It certainly carries out what one would believe to be the intention of the original founder of the Trust, and at the same time it is in thorough conformity with the most advanced ideas of higher education in this country. I beg to move the Second Reading of the Bill.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

The Earl of Crewe.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, I am afraid that I am not qualified to discuss this subject with the noble Earl the Lord President, but I should like to put one or two questions. I should like to ask, in the first place, whether this is the usual procedure in dealing with charities of this kind. My impression was that it was not necessary to proceed by way of a public Bill, but if the noble Earl corrects me I, of course, shall have nothing more to say on that head. But that leads me to the more substantial question, whether we are to understand that this is a Bill which is now to be passed by consent—that is to say, that all those who are interested in the charity have now come to agreement with regard to the provisions of the Bill. If it is an unopposed Bill it will not call for so much consideration at the hands of your Lordships, but if there are persons interested who object, probably at the Committee stage we may have to ask further questions.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: My Lords, I may inform the noble Marquess that it is by no means unusual, in the case of very large schemes of this kind, to proceed by public Bill, and to do what is done here. There are plenty of precedents for this course. With regard to the other point raised by the noble Marquess, so far as I know there is no opposition to this Bill. I have no reason to believe that any Amendments will be moved, but, if there are any, we shall, of course, consider them in Committee.

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3862. Denmark.

No. 3863. Japan (Tainan, South Formosa).

No. 3864. Persia (Resht and Astarabad).

No. 3865. Turkey (Basra).

No. 3866. France (Nice).

No. 3867. Turkey (Salonica).

AGRICULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION (IRELAND).

Report on the trade in imports and exports at Irish ports during the year year ended 31st December, 1905.

IRISH RAILWAYS.

1. First Report of the Viceregal Commission.

2. Appendix to same.

INDIA RAILWAYS.

Administration Report on the railways in India, for the calendar year 1906.

CONGESTION IN IRELAND (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Fifth Report of the Commissioners, with appendix (minutes of evidence taken in London, 12th to 28th March, 1907, and documents relating thereto).

OSBORNE.

Report by the house governor and medical superintendent, for the year ended 31st March, 1907.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.

Order in Council, dated 6th July, 1907, provided that Buckie shall be a place of registry for sea fishing boats.

GREENWICH HOSPITAL ACT, 1865.

Order in Council, dated 6th July, 1907, authorising a higher scale of salary for the Director of Greenwich Hospital.

WINTER ASSIZES ACTS, 1876 AND 1877.

Seven Orders in Council, dated 6th July, 1907, relating to the ensuing winter assizes.

EXTRADITION ACTS, 1870 TO 1906.

Orders in Council, dated 6th July, 1907—For giving effect to a Supplementary Convention concluded between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and the Kingdom of Belgium for the mutual surrender of fugitive criminals;

For giving effect to an agreement concluded between the United Kingdom of Great Britian and Ireland and the Kingdom of Norway for the mutual surrender of fugitive criminals;

Ordering that the operation of the Extradition Acts, 1870 to 1906, shall be suspended within the Dominion of Canada so long as Part I. of Chapter 155 of "The Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906," shall continue in force.

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.

Orders in Council, dated 6th July 1907—Providing for the Government of Cyprus;

Entitled "The Ashanti Order in Council, 1907";

Entitled "The Northern Territories Order in Council, 1907";

Entitled "The Nyasaland Order in Council, 1907."

BRITISH SETTLEMENTS ACT, 1887, AND FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.

Orders in Council, dated 6th July, 1907, entitled—The Pacific Order in Council, 1907;

The Pacific Islands Civil Marriages Order in Council, 1907.

NAVAL AND MARINE PAY AND PENSIONS ACT, 1865.

Orders in Council, dated 6th July, 1907, approving Memorials of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty praying sanction to—An Amendment of the regulations so as to provide that officers appointed to a surveying ship commissioned at home for service abroad shall draw surveying pay from the date of joining the ship;

The payment of certain allowances to naval and marine officers studying Chinese in China;

Certain modifications in the conditions of service of officers' servants;

A new scale of allowances to lamp trimmers on board His Majesty's ships.

SUPERANNUATION.

Treasury Minute, dated 15th July, 1907, granting a retired allowance to Mr. Harry Banks, officer of Beeston Station, 2nd Class Inland Revenue, under Section 2 of the Superannuation Act, 1887.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

POST OFFICE SITES BILL.

Brought from the Commons. Read 1ª; to be printed, and referred to the Examiners. (No. 124.)

ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSION—RETURN.

EARL NELSON rose to move for a Return showing—(1) The present amount of the fund which devolved upon the Ecclesiastical Commissioners from the Church Building Commissioners on 1st January, 1857, under 19 & 20 Vict., c. 55, together with a Dr. and Cr. Account of the above fund since 31st October, 1876. (In continuation of Return No. 71A, ordered to be printed 22nd June, 1877); (2) The churches in aid of the erection of which grants or "nominal grants" have been made out of the above-named fund, with the amount of the grants in each case; the population of the district to be assigned to such churches at the time of making such grant, and the accommodation proposed to be afforded by the churches to which such grants have been made; also to specify whether the grant was actually paid, or if paid, subsequently refunded. (In continuation of Return No. 71, ordered to be printed 14th May, 1877); (3) The churches for which scales of pew rents have been fixed by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners under 19 & 20 Vict., c. 104, since 3rd February, 1876, specifying in each case the total number and position of the seats authorised to be let, the rents authorised to be taken, and the total number of sittings in each church; stating also, if any such scales have been rescinded since the original scale was fixed. (In continuation of Return No. 71, ordered to be printed 14th May, 1877); (4) The churches for which scales of pew rents have been fixed by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners under the Church Building Acts since 9th August, 1876, specifying in each case the total number and position of the seats authorised to be let, the rents authorised to be taken, and the total number of sittings in each church; stating also if any such scales have been rescinded since the original scale was fixed. (In continuation of Return No. 71, ordered to be printed 14th May, 1877.)

The noble Earl said: My Lords, the Return for which I move is a continuation of a Return which was made to the House some thirty years ago, and which was called for because there was a Parish Church Bill about to be brought before the House at that time, and it was essential to provide information on the subject. I am hopeful next session of bringing forward such a Bill again, and therefore it will be of importance that this Return should be made up to date. But there is another reason. It was enacted, in connection with the giving of grants from this Fund in aid of the erection of churches, that a certain number of free seats should be allotted in exact proportion, both in quantity and position, to those in respect of which pew rents were charged. The outcome of that was that for the purpose of fulfilling this condition churches were very frequently actually divided down the middle, one side being entirely free, and the other pew rented. The practical outcome of that was that the two arrangements did not very well agree, and a good many of these churches, I am happy to say, became entirely free churches; but in others there is a danger that the free seats may be encroached upon and be let as pews. According to the Act there is a regular allotment of seats and a Return made by order of the Commissioners showing exactly where each seat rented is placed and what sum is charged as rent. I believe this fund has very nearly come to an end, but nevertheless there has been no Return for thirty years, and I think it is of very great importance that we should have a Return up to date. It is only according to the scale appointed by the Commissioners that there is any sanction to let seats in churches, and those who are anxious to preserve the right of free seats are desirous that this Return should be rendered up to date to enable them to take care that no encroachments are made upon the legal rights of the people.

Moved, "That there be laid before the House a Return showing (1) The present amount of the fund which devolved upon the Ecclesiastical Commissioners from the Church Building Commissioners on the 1st January, 1857, under 19 & 20 Vict., c. 55, together with a Dr. and Cr. Account of the above fund since the 31st of October, 1876. (In continuation of Return No. 71A, ordered to be printed 22nd June, 1877); (2) The churches in aid of the erection of which grant or "nominal grants" have been made out of the above-named fund, with the amount of the grants in each case; the population of the district to be assigned to such churches at the time of making such grant, and the accommodation proposed to be afforded by the churches to which such grants have been made; also to specify whether the grant was actually paid, or if paid, subsequently refunded. (In continuation of Return, No. 71, ordered to be printed 14th May, 1877); (3) The churches for which scales of pew rents have been fixed by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners under 19 & 20 Vict. c. 104, since the 3rd of February, 1876, specifying in each case the total number and position of the seats authorised to be let, the rents authorised to be taken, and the total number of sittings in each church; stating also, if any such scales have been rescinded since the original scale was fixed. (In continuation of Return No. 71, ordered to be printed 14th May, 1877); (4) The churches for which scales of pew rents have been fixed by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners under the Church Building Acts since the 9th of August, 1876, specifying in each case the total number and position of the seats authorised to be let, the rents authorised to be taken, and the total number of sittings in each church; stating also, if any such scales have been rescinded since the original scale was fixed. (In continuation of Return No. 71, ordered to be printed 14th May, 1877.)"—(*The Earl Nelson.*)

*THE EARL OF CREWE: My Lords, we have no objection to giving the Return for which the noble Earl has moved.

On Question, Motion agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

QUALIFICATION OF WOMEN (COUNTY AND TOWN COUNCILS) (SCOTLAND) BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to Order).

[The Earl of ONSLOW in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN moved an Amendment to provide that a woman should not be qualified to be elected as convener of a county council or provost of a burgh. He explained that in the English Bill their Lordships decided that, although a woman was to be eligible to be elected to a county or borough council, she was not to be eligible to occupy the position of mayor of a borough or chairman of a county council. In Scotland the corresponding terms were provost of a burgh or convener of a county council. He begged to move.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 7, after the word 'not' to insert the words, '(*a*) be elected as convener of a county council or provost of a burgh; or.'"—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

LORD HAMILTON OF DALZELL said the Government could not accept the Amendment. He did not, however, contend, any more than did his noble friend the Lord President of the Council when a similar Amendment was moved to the English Bill, that this was a matter which was really vital to the Bill; but he asked their Lordships to consider whether this was not a question which might very properly and safely be left to the local bodies to settle for themselves. He did not suppose that if the Bill became law they would see a very large number of ladies elected to serve upon these local authorities. That, at all events, had not been their experience with regard to parish councils and school boards, and still less did he suppose that if their Lordships rejected this Amendment they were likely to see a very large number of lady provosts or lady conveners. The case was not exactly similar in Scotland, because he believed there was a feeling in favour of this latitude being allowed to local bodies on account of the several ladies who had presided over parish councils and school boards—notably the case of Miss Stevenson, in Edinburgh; and he asked their Lordships not to impose a restriction which he believed was totally unnecessary, and which might be found in practice to be of a very irritating nature.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH hoped the Committee would adopt the Amendment. The case for the acceptance of this limitation in regard to Scotland was a great deal stronger than the case, so far as he could learn it from the debate the other day, in regard to England. The noble Lord had mentioned the well-known case of an eminent lady who was chairwoman of a school board in Edinburgh. Unlike England the school boards remained in Scotland, and the case for putting ladies on county and town councils was not so strong as in England, for there were very few duties in the administration of which it could be said the assistance of ladies was necessary. He hoped that the very reasonable prohibition which was proposed in the Amendment would be accepted by their Lordships for Scotland as it had been in the case of England. If the noble Earl went to a division he would support him.

LORD COURTNEY OF PENWITH said their Lordships certainly accepted a similar proposal with regard to England, but he thought it was done a little hurriedly, and the majority in favour of that Amendment was relatively small. The argument which the noble Lord who had just sat down had addressed to their Lordships was not, he contended, relative to the Amendment. The noble Lord had said that because women could sit on school boards in Scotland there was no necessity for them to be qualified to sit on county and town councils. But that was an argument against the principle of the Bill. Their Lordships had read the Bill a second time, and the only question now was whether, if the majority of a county or town council wished to appoint a woman member as convener or provost, which was unlikely but was possible, she should be qualified to occupy that position. He thought Parliament should not grudgingly say that a council should be precluded from electing a woman of proved capacity to either of these positions. He hoped their Lordships would not be influenced by the precedent in the English Bill.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY said he was not present when the division took place on a similar Amendment in the English Bill, but if he had been in the House he would have felt compelled to vote in favour of that Amendment, although he strongly supported giving women power to sit on these bodies. He knew of no reason why they should give to local bodies in Scotland this power which they denied to local bodies in England. Indeed, their Lordships would be stultifying themselves unless they supported Lord Camperdown's Amendment.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN said this question was decided in the English Bill by sixty-one votes to forty-nine. He did not know that there was any great difference between women in Scotland and women in England, and if their Lordships were of opinion that it was better, on the whole, that women should not preside over county councils or borough councils in England, it was better also that they should not be conveners of county councils or provosts of burghs in Scotland. He did not wish to put it higher than that. It seemed to him that the argument was very much the same in the two cases. He thought the Committee would be arriving at a rather strange decision if, without stating exactly what the grounds were, they differentiated between the two countries, and reversed the decision formerly come to in regard to England.

THE EARL OF CREWE: My Lords, your Lordships remember, no doubt, what happened in regard to the English Bill. On that occasion, while expressing a preference, on behalf of the Government, for allowing ladies to hold these posts in the rare cases in which they are likely to be elected, we did not desire to make it appear anything like a cardinal point in the Bill. The noble Earl, Lord Camperdown, speaks of reversing that decision. Whether the decision is a reversal would entirely depend on whether the circumstances are precisely the same in the two countries. We are given to understand that in Scotland the feeling in favour of retaining this provision in the Bill is stronger than we had any reason to suppose it was in England.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: Can the noble Earl give us his reasons for that opinion?

THE EARL OF CREWE: I am not competent to speak from first-hand knowledge; but I suppose it is founded on what hon. Gentlemen in the other House who represent Scotland think is the opinion of their constituents.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: They are not Scotsmen.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: In the circumstances we do not wish to put the House to the trouble of a division, and when the Question is put we shall say "Not Content," with the result, of course, of leaving my right hon. friend in another place a free hand in the matter.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

*THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN then moved the deletion of paragraph (*b*) of Clause 1—

> (*b*) if elected as chairman of a county council or provost of a burgh, by virtue of holding or having held that office be a justice of the peace or burgh magistrate, or be eligible for election, or for acting, as a burgh magistrate, or as a judge in any police court: Provided that where a woman is elected as provost of a burgh the number of bailies to be elected in the burgh shall while she holds office as provost be one more than the number otherwise fixed by law, and any additional bailie so elected shall hold office for the period prescribed by the law regulating the office of burgh magistrate or bailie, subject to the provision that he shall in no case continue to hold office after the woman has ceased to hold office as provost.

This Amendment was consequential upon the Amendment which their Lordships had just agreed to, providing that a woman should not be eligible for either of these positions.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 1, line 11, to leave out from the word 'appeal' to the end of paragraph (*b*)"—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived; the Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow; and Bill to be printed as amended. [No. 126.]

THE AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS ACT, 1906.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: My Lords, I rise to call attention to a memorial lately presented to the Board of Agriculture by sheep farmers in the Highlands of Scotland, with reference to the probable effect of Section 1 subsection (2) of the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1906, upon the valuation of sheep stocks; and to ask what measures it is proposed to take to meet their complaints. The sheep farmers in the Highlands of Scotland, I think I may say almost to a man, have been greatly disturbed on seeing in print Section 1 of the Act of 1906, and they have been advised that it is at least doubtful whether the proper interpretation of subsection (2) does not do away with the system of valuing sheep stock embodied in their leases. Let me, in the first instance, read to your Lordships the subsection in question. Subsection (2) of Section 1 enacts that—

> "All questions which, under the Agricultural Holdings (England) Acts, 1883 to 1900, or the Agricultural Holdings (Scotland) Acts, 1883 to 1900, or this Act, or under a contract of tenancy, are referred to arbitration shall, whether the matter to which the arbitration relates arose before or after the passing of this Act, be determined, notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary, by a single arbitrator."

Your Lordships will see that everything which is so mentioned is to be referred to arbitration. There is no special definition of what are to be the subjects of arbitration so as in any way to distinguish definitely between what is to be arbitrated upon and, on the other hand, valuation. Legal language in Scotland, and also the language of Scottish leases is curious in character, and probably would sound strange to many lawyers who live on the south side of the Border. But your Lordships must remember that this Act was originally drawn for England and was extended to Scotland.

When that Bill was in this House there were numerous complaints made from these Benches by noble Lords connected with Scotland that, with regard to several matters, great doubt existed as to whether an enactment applicable to England would suit Scotland, and this section was one of those to which attention was called. Your Lordships will remember that the Act does not come into force until 1st January, 1909, and, therefore, no cases have actually arisen; but as soon as it appeared in print Scottish farmers were advised that it would probably interfere with their sheep valuations. Accordingly they held a series of meetings, and they have, I believe, constituted a committee to which they have entrusted the duty of getting rid, as they say, of this obnoxious clause. Meetings have been held in every part of the country—in Perth, Oban, Inverness, Kirkcudbright, and, I believe, in many other places—and they one and all decided that this is an unwarrantable interference by Parliament with their business.

I could read to your Lordships, if it were desirable, many extracts from the reports of those meetings, which are by no means complimentary to Parliament; but it is quite sufficient, I think, to say that on three things they are unanimous. In the first place, they observe that all existing leases are made subject to this Act. To that they take the very strongest exception. In the second place, they say that the meaning of the word "arbitration" is most doubtful. For the purpose of valuing sheep in Scotland two valuers are appointed, who, in the legal language of that country, are called arbiters, and they appoint an oversman. It is their duty, not only to value sheep, but also to have regard to the nature of the country in which the sheep live, on which their value largely depends. Therefore, it is not a simple valuation of sheep, but the taking into consideration of other circumstances; and farmers are advised, rightly or wrongly, that it is extremely doubtful whether in the circumstances this valuation does not become an arbitration, and thereby subject to the Act. Sheep farmers have, as I have said, held meetings in all parts of the country, and they attended a meeting of the Highland Agricultural Society in Edinburgh, where I have no doubt they hoped to have the opportunity of meeting my noble friend the President of the Board of Agriculture. Luckily for him, he had other things to attend to, but he sent Sir Thomas Elliott, a very able representative of the Board of Agriculture. Sir Thomas Elliott was subjected to a heckling which occupied two or three columns of the newspaper, in which the matters I have just mentioned to your Lordships were very forcibly and plainly brought before him, and I have no doubt he has reported to my noble friend that the utmost dissatisfaction prevails among the sheep farmers of Scotland in regard to this Act.

Unquestionably a doubt exists as to what is the meaning of this subsection. Now was it necessary that that doubt should exist? There was no necessity for it whatsoever. When the Bill was in your Lordships' House this point was called attention to by several noble Lords, and I for one pointed out to my noble friend that if he did not take care, the words as they stood might be taken to extend to sheep valuations; and my noble friend accepted from me, and said he was obliged for the suggestion, words which did away with all possibility of doubt on that matter. The words were—

> "Provided that nothing in this section shall interfere with or prevent any contract or agreement between the landlord or tenant for an outgoing or other valuation."

Those words may not satisfy the best of draftsmen, but to the ordinary agriculturist I think they conveyed a very clear meaning. The Bill was read a third time in your Lordships' House on 19th December, and went down from this House with that proviso in it.

When the Bill reached the other House the matter was dealt with by the Solicitor-General for England, and not by the representatives of the Scottish Office. And when I say that I cannot help remembering that from beginning to end the Scottish Office never gave the slightest assistance to my noble friend or to Parliament with regard to anything in the Bill, with this exception, that they introduced two Amendments which were entirely outside the scope of the Bill and were not really taken into consideration. But in the House of Commons Sir William Robson said he considered the proviso unnecessary and irrelevant. He said that the subsection dealt with arbitration and not with valuation, and he thought that if the words were inserted they might create a great deal of confusion. We all know that Sir William Robson is an eminent lawyer, but I feel pretty sure he knows nothing about Scottish sheep farming and the system of valuation in that country. The words were accordingly struck out, and when the Bill was returned to your Lordships my noble friend asked this House not to adhere to their Amendment. Of course, an Amendment of that description your Lordships would not adhere to, particularly as this was on the 21st of December, and we prorogued on the 22nd. But I took the opportunity of warning my noble friend that before he was two years older he would find himself in considerable trouble. As soon as the Act was in print the agitation commenced, and I think my noble friend

The Earl of Camperdown.

will find that Scottish farmers when once roused are not very easy to quiet again.

Now, what measures is it proposed to take to meet these complaints? I do not know that my noble friend can do anything unless he will amend the Act. I see that the opinion of the Scottish Law Officers and the English Law Officers is being taken. They have been some weeks deliberating, but their opinion has not yet appeared, but when it does appear how can it in any way forward the settlement of this question, or decide what matters are to be referred to arbitration and what are not? Sir Thomas Elliott, with great wisdom, advised the farmers to appoint a committee to confer with him. They did so, but without prejudice to their future proceedings. But what can a committee do? They can do nothing. These words are in an Act of Parliament, and if any Amendment is to be made it must be by an amending clause, or else things will remain *in statu quo* until some landlord or tenant thinks it to his interest to try and get over his obligation, and appeals to have the sheep stock valued by one arbitrator instead of by three men as at present.

I am bound to say that my noble friend has got into this difficulty without any reason whatsoever. If, instead of consulting the Solicitor-General of England, who knows nothing about agriculture—I am sure he would not make any claim of the kind — my noble friend had consulted Sir Thomas Elliott and his permanent officials, and had acted on their advice, this agitation in Scotland would never have arisen. I daresay the Government may consider that it may possibly turn out that these valuations are to be treated separately from arbitration; but, even then, you have disquieted the minds of all these people, and you have annoyed them in the prosecution of their business. I notice that at the meeting at Edinburgh an agent of one large estate in Argyleshire said that no less than eight large sheep farmers had given notice in consequence of this Act. Those of your Lordships who know anything of Scotland know what the receiving of notice from eight sheep farmers means to a property.

That is the first result of the Act. The difficulty arises from a fault inherent in the Act, which is that Parliament has set up its own written law against the custom of the country in the matter of contracts. There are a hundred farmers at least who never refer to their lease or their agreement and who are guided by the custom of the country to every one who looks to the Act of Parliament for the management of his affairs. But if Parliament is determined that agricultural business shall be conducted according to Act of Parliament, at least let that Act be drafted in terms which are intelligible to agriculturists and to the people who will have to live or to suffer under that Act. I can assure my noble friend that the feeling in Scotland is very strong indeed. I have had a good deal of correspondence on the matter, and one gentleman, of whose political opinions I am ignorant, writes—

> "I notice that the present House of Commons steer clear of every suggestion made by the House of Lords for the amendment of their Bills, but so far as the present and recent agricultural legislation is concerned, most Scottish agriculturists look to the House of Lords for effective criticism and Amendment of the various Bills. We seem to have returned to Parliament representatives who, however anxious they may be to do right, have not sufficient practical knowledge of agriculture to know what is right and what is wrong."

I do not think I need add anything to that; but I hope my noble friend will devise some means whereby he can clear up the doubts which at present exist with regard to the construction of this subsection.

* LORD LOVAT: My Lords, I would like to associate myself with what has been said by my noble friend Lord Camperdown. This matter was one of considerable importance in Scotland, particularly in the Highlands. A considerable proportion of the seven million sheep in Scotland are held under leases which contain the principle of valuation, and it does not require very much calculation to show that the substitution of arbitration for valuation might leave a man who had farmed successfully over a series of years a distinct loser on going out of his lease. More particularly would this be the case if the arbitrator was not cognisant of the character of the stock, the local conditions, and such like matters. On a farm with a rental of £200 it would be no unusual thing to find sheep stock of the value of £4,000. Therefore a question of a few shillings difference in the valuation of

good to them, attach the very greatest importance to having in the first instance two arbiters both of whom know the locality.

EARL CARRINGTON: There is nothing under the Act which stops that, nothing whatever.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: That is the whole question.

EARL CARRINGTON: The noble Earl has given his case away. There is nothing in the Act to change that arrangement. If the arbiters cannot agree, they choose another man, and he is the sole abitrator whose decision is final. There is no doubt about that.

VISCOUNT HILL: But the Act only provides for one arbitrator.

EARL CARRINGTON: The two arbiters appoint an oversman, and if the arbiters cannot agree on an oversman, then under the Scottish law the appointment is made by the sheriff or sheriff's substitute, and the decision of the oversman so appointed is absolute and final. That is the state of the law as it is at the present moment. The question is whether there is any difference between valuation and arbitration under the new Act. If the Courts hold that valuation is not arbitration, there will be no change of any kind. If they hold that valuation is arbitration, the only difference will be that the oversman will be appointed by the Board of Agriculture instead of by the sheriff or the sheriff's substitute. That is the only difference brought about by the subsection referred to. My noble friend Lord Breadalbane, in a long memorandum he has written on the subject, suggests that sworn valuators should be appointed in Scotland, and if that were done the matter would, of course, be very simple. I agree that it is necessary that in these complicated cases the men should have a certain amount of local knowledge and be acquainted with the customs of the country. Some Scottish farmers have complained—and I am bound to say not without reason—that some years ago, in my predecessor's time, an old Army man was sent down from Edinburgh to make a valuation. But I have gone to the bottom of that, and I find that it was an agricultural valuation and not a sheep valuation. I can only say that during my term of office no old Army man will be sent down for this work. The Board will, of course, send proper men to make these valuations. I might be permitted to read an extract from a letter that was written a few days ago by a gentleman in Argyleshire. He writes—

> "We are quite satisfied that the Board of Agriculture will appoint competent men to conduct these valuations should the appointment fall to the Board."

So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly ready to give a distinct pledge to your Lordships, and through Scottish Peers to the Scottish farmers, that if unfortunately it should be my duty to have to appoint oversmen I will do the best I possibly can to choose men from the class which has given such satisfaction hitherto. I should be under a great obligation if the sheriffs and sheriffs' substitutes would be good enough to send in the names of some of the men who have served the lairds and the farmers to their common satisfaction. The noble Earl Lord Camperdown told us that the farmers had been advised that this subsection would interfere with the valuation of sheep.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: I said they had been advised that it might interfere with the present system.

EARL CARRINGTON: The noble Earl did not tell us who the advising gentleman was; but I hope I have been able to dissipate some of the, perhaps not unnatural, fears which have been spread far and wide on this subject. I trust that the farmers of Scotland will be reassured by what I have said, and that on consideration they will think there has been a great cry about very little wool.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: My Lords, I really despair of attempting to do justice to the speech we have just heard from the noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture. It was extremely interesting and covered a great variety of subjects, but until quite the last words, I venture to say, he did not come at all near the very simple question asked by my noble friend Lord Camperdown. The question of my noble friend had reference to the measures it is proposed to take to meet certain complaints, and the essence of the question was to find out whether the Board of Agriculture have now, after this lapse of time, made up their minds, on proper legal advice, as to what the effect will be of the Act which was passed last year. All we want to know is, Have the Board of Agriculture taken an opinion on the subject, and, if they have, are they prepared to say what it is? Or are they going to leave the question to be settled by litigation?

The noble Earl dealt with a great variety of subjects. He said he thought the heather was on fire. We then had an interesting account of his first visit to Scotland, of which he gave us very much the same version once or twice last year. I can assure my noble friend that he is personally very popular in Scotland. He made a most favourable impression, and I am not in the least one of those who desire to see anyone else substituted as the head of the agricultural authority for Scotland. The noble Earl then said that if he was not well received he would have been glad to send in his cap and jacket. He next had the usual hit at unscrupulous landlords, and then he seemed to come near to the point, and I thought we were going to get an answer to the question. But having said that this was a difficult and complicated subject he branched off again, and quoted the opinion of a certain Mr. Norman Reid. Then he alluded to the exaggerated value paid under the existing system for sheep. This was followed by some reminiscences of the Welsh Commission, and an extremely interesting discussion as to whether a ewe and a lamb were one animal or two, and at what period they became two. We next had a description of the system of valuation of sheep in Scotland, and then we again came near the question.

Over and over again the noble Earl said it was not their intention in the Act to alter the law of valuation. We like our system of more or less friendly valuation, with the appointment of a third man as oversman; and the simple question at issue is this, Did a particular subsection in the Act of last year make the continuance of that system in the future impossible or not? That is the question on the Paper, and to that question the noble Earl has given no answer at all. He said he would be very sorry if it were proved that the Act had altered the law, and that he would do his best to make the inconvenience caused by the refusal of the House of Commons to accept our words as light as possible. But the inference I am entitled to draw from the noble Earl's statement is that he has a good deal more than a little fear that the law has been altered. The noble Earl shakes his head, and I am very glad to note it. I hope he will be able to give us more definite information as to what he has been advised by those in his Department or by the Law Officers whom he has consulted.

If the existing custom has been swept away by the Act of last year we should accept with great pleasure anything the noble Lord could do to reduce the inconvenience which would then be caused; but the suggestion that sheriffs and sheriffs substitutes should send up names of fit persons to the Board of Agriculture would not meet the case. At present two neighbours meet to value the sheep stock; if they do not agree they call in a third person; and that is done with a minimum of expense and trouble. No individual sent down by the Board of Agriculture and no statutory provision can do anything to minimise the inconvenience that will be caused if that system is done away with. But, if it has been done away with, it is striking testimony to the treatment this House received last year, because we foresaw the danger and amended the Bill; but the Amendment, which was absolutely inoffensive, was rejected in another place on the advice of an English Law Officer. That circumstance ought to be a severe lesson to this House not to be so complaisant in future in accepting the rejection of Amendments inserted on practical knowledge and from a real fear of inconvenience arising. I hope the unrest existing on this question in Scotland will be taken into consideration by the Board of Agriculture, and if they can get legal opinion to the effect that the law has not been altered, I hope they will publish it with as little delay as possible.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord TWEEDMOUTH): My Lords, we have had a great deal of talk about a very small point. I quite agree that this question of sheep valuation in Scotland is a very important one, and deserves a great deal of consideration; but the Act of last year really does not alter the position at all. There are appointed two arbiters to discuss the matter in the first instance. What generally occurs is that these two arbiters, before they begin their work, settle on an oversman, who is to be brought in if necessary. That will go on under the Act just as in the past. If no oversman is appointed and there is a difference between the two arbiters, the old custom was for an oversman to be appointed by the sheriff or the sheriff substitute; under the new system it is proposed that the Board of Agriculture should make the appointment, as they are well able to do.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: I am sorry to interrupt the noble Lord, but I am sure he wishes that we should be agreed as to the facts. He said a moment ago that if there was a difference between the arbiters the oversman would be appointed by the sheriff or the sheriff-substitute, and that the place of those officials would now be taken by the Board of Agriculture. But that is not the sole point. The noble Lord left out of consideration the case in which these two arbiters are originally appointed and in which they appoint the oversman. It is to that the sheep farmers attach all the importance—to the oversman being appointed by the arbiters they themselves have named.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: But under the Act the two arbiters can appoint the oversman exactly as they could in the past; it is only when they fail to appoint one that the necessity arises for somebody else to appoint him. My contention is that the Board of Agriculture is perfectly able to find an oversman who is acquainted with the conditions of the particular district. My noble friend says that the Board of Agriculture will be very glad to take the view of the local people as to the men to be appointed. I think that is a very good offer. With regard to the measures which it is proposed to take to meet these complaints, I may say that an inquiry has been held, but the Report has not yet been received. The Act does not come into operation till 1909, so we have two years in which to consider whether any little adjustment can be made. All I can say is that the desire of the Government is that these things should be satisfactorily and fairly settled and in a way that will be pleasant to the people of Scotland.

EARL CAWDOR: My Lords, we have at last arrived at something which would have been more convenient if it had been told us by the noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture—namely, that an inquiry has been held into this subject, and after the Report has been looked into some statement, I assume, will be made on the subject. I hope we shall have that statement at as early a date as possible. I think the noble Earl, in professing to answer the question, might have told us that some inquiry had been held. As a matter of fact, the noble Earl entirely failed to answer the question. The point, I venture to suggest, is not a small one, but one of vital importance to the farmers of Scotland who are interested in sheep valuations. Last year my noble friend Lord Camperdown, and other noble Lords who understand this question from a practical point of view, suggested that if the clause passed as it was then drawn there was great risk that the existing system of valuation would be thought to be upset, and the noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture accepted an Amendment on the point from Lord Camperdown and declared it to be a valuable addition to the Bill. But when the Bill reached the other House, Scottish opinion seems to have been set aside, with the result that the clause was put back in its old form. The consequence is that there is a strong feeling of doubt in Scotland whether the old system of valuation has not been done away with. The First Lord of the Admiralty says the law has not been altered. Will the noble Lord tell me that that is the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown?

EARL CARRINGTON: They have not yet reported.

EARL CAWDOR: Then it is unknown whether the law has been altered or not. I do think we are entitled to a definite statement on that subject, and I would ask whether whether when the noble

Earl gets the Report he will lay it on the Table.

EARL CARRINGTON: I promised that.

EARL CAWDOR: I did not hear the noble Earl say so. I now understand that he has promised your Lordships that he will lay the opinion of the Law Officers on this point before the House.

THE EARL OF CREWE: No, no.

EARL CAWDOR: I understood the noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture to say a moment ago that he would lay it.

EARL CARRINGTON: The best of us make mistakes sometimes, and I made one then.

EARL CAWDOR: Well, what is to be our position in this matter? If the Government know what the law is, can there be any earthly objection to the farmers of Scotland knowing where they stand? The noble Lord the First Lord of the Admiralty said he hoped this matter would be entirely cleared up and that the minds of Scottish farmers would shortly be relieved. But that cannot be done unless we are told what the opinion of the Law Officers is. It was to elicit that information that the Question was placed on the Paper. We want to know what the law is, and I press again that we should have absolute and definite information on the point.

THE EARL OF CREWE: My Lords, I think there is some little misunderstanding as to what my noble friend did intend to convey and what he did not intend to convey. I have no personal knowledge of this subject, but I understand he is prepared to lay a Report embodying the opinion of his legal advisers, but he is not prepared to lay the opinion of the Law Officers, because that is a practice which we never follow.

IRISH POOR LAW REFORM.

LORD MONTEAGLE OF BRANDON rose to call attention to the Report of the Viceregal Commission on Poor Law Reform in Ireland, and to move, "That in the opinion of this House the Irish Poor Law system demands the immediate attention of His Majesty's Government with a view to its reform." The noble Lord said: My Lords, I am sorry to have to call the attention of the House from the entertaining subject of sheep valuation in Scotland to the more sombre question of Irish Poor Law reform; but I trust, at any rate, that I need make no apology to the House for introducing this subject to your notice, as its importance cannot be denied. The particular reason for my bringing it on at this moment was a resolution recently passed by the South Dublin Union begging a society connected with this subject, the Irish Workhouse Association, of which I am president, to bring the matter before Parliament, and as the Report of the Viceregal Commission was presented some eight or nine months ago to both Houses of Parliament, I think it is time that some notice should be taken of it.

This Report, which I think will be admitted on all hands to be an extremely important one, has hardly received, even in Ireland, the attention which it deserves, and up to the present time it has received no attention beyond a passing question or two, from either House of Parliament. I conclude my Notice with a Motion urging this matter on the attention of the Government, but I may fairly assume that the Irish Government, at all events, have considered this Report without any prompting from me. I hope we may now hear some definite pronouncement from the Government as to their intentions in the matter. It is difficult, in dealing with a question which one has greatly at heart, to be as brief as is becoming, perhaps, but I shall endeavour not to trespass unduly upon the patience of the House. I shall try to treat the question in a broad fashion and not to go unnecessarily into details, although the details in this matter are of extreme importance.

I will leave matters of details to noble Lords who will follow me in the debate, and will give a brief account, in the first place, of the existing state of affairs revealed in the Report, and then consider the particular proposals made by the Commissioners for dealing with that state of things. What are the classes that have to be dealt with in this matter and what are their numbers? There are some 45,000 indoor paupers in Ireland, and it is with indoor paupers mainly that the Report deals. Of these nearly one-third are hosptital sick, about 14,500; nearly another third, about the same number, are aged and infirm; there are 6,000 children, 3,500 lunatics and sane epileptics, 2,000 unmarried mothers, 1,500 casuals and vagrants, and some 3,000 other able-bodied paupers.

Setting aside the 3,000 able-bodied paupers, who are rather a miscellaneous crowd not very easily classified, there are six other classes, and when the Commissioners came to go into the matter in the light of their terms of reference they very soon found that with regard to four out of these six classes there was an almost unanimous feeling in the country that those should be dealt with apart from the workhouse. I think that is a very important and significant fact, and it naturally made a very great impression on the minds of the Commissioners. These four classes—the hospital sick, the children, the lunatics and sane epileptics, and the casuals and vagrants—embrace 25,000 out of the 45,000, considerably more than half the total, and that fact, as I say, naturally made a very great impression on the minds of the Commissioners. In order to get these out of the workhouses you must have a better system of classification. Four out of the five heads of the terms of reference to the Commission directed them to inquire, roughly speaking, into questions hinging on amalgamation of unions with the object of getting better classification. But they found that amalgamation, as a mere administrative act without legislative action, would not carry them very far and would not enable them to meet the expectation of the country in the way of reform.

I will read the passage in which the Commissioners sum up that part of the question. In regard to two of the six classes I have named the case is not quite so strong. But summing up this part of the question the Commissioners say—

> "We think that the present system of keeping so many different classes of persons in the same institution is one that ought not to be continued, and we received evidence throughout Ireland strongly in favour of changing the system in this respect providing that the rates would not be increased."

Following up this line of inquiry, the Commissioners proceeded in their Report to make suggestions to the Lord-Lieutenant for legislation involving changes, many of them of a radical nature, in the Poor law and its administration, and in the course of doing so they produced an extremely weighty document in which they formulated a scheme which, for its thorough and comprehensive character and its unity and consistency of purpose, I think is remarkable among Reports of Royal and Viceregal Commissioners.

As to whether there is need for reform I do not ask the House or the Government now to pronounce upon the Report in detail. Nor do I ask the Government to say what they are going to do. But I do very earnestly press upon them that the time for action has come, and that this matter ought not to be hung up any further. As the House will readily understand from the brief description I have given, the Report of the Commission embraces many far-reaching proposals and radical changes. Many of these are highly debateable, and I do not profess myself to adopt them all; but I hope that His Majesty's Government will agree that the Report does require their earnest and speedy attention, and I hope they may be prepared to deal with it next session.

I will now proceed briefly to outline the scheme proposed by the Commissioners for dealing with the present state of affairs. They describe the main feature of their proposals as—

> "The breaking up of the workhouse system of gathering together all the various classes of the healthy and infirm destitute poor into the same institution."

This they propose to carry out in this way. The workhouse hospitals for dealing with the sick poor they propose to retain, but to retain them not as workhouse hospitals but as district hospitals; and the difference in Ireland I can assure the House is considerably more than a mere difference of name. That principle was already laid down in the Act of 1898. An enabling clause was included in that Act giving facilities for effecting this change, but that clause has not had any operation, and without some more distinct legislation I do not think it can be carried out. Then the lunatics and sane epileptics they propose should be sent to special auxiliary asylums, and the aged and infirm to almshouses, one for each county; the children they propose to board out universally, and unmarried mothers who have fallen for the first time they propose to send to religious institutions, and habitual offenders to labour colonies. There only remain the casual and vagrant class, with whom I believe my noble friend on my left is going to deal. I will only say of them that the proposal is that they should be dealt with, not under Poor Law authorities, but under a prisons board in labour colonies. Those are the main suggestions of the Commissioners, and I think it will be admitted that they are sufficiently bold and sweeping.

The Commissioners anticipate a very considerable improvement in the administration of the Poor Law by these measures. They hope not only for more humane and more reformative treatment, but also for economy. I wish I could feel quite so sure about the economy as I feel about the humane and reformative treatment. But there will be elements of economy. The number of institutions will be largely decreased as well as the number of officials connected with them. That, of course, would be an element of economy; but, on the other hand, I am afraid the new machinery may not always tend to efficiency and to economy, and that in some respects their recommendations in this matter may require very careful consideration. But, taking these recommendations broadly, and the central one that there should be a better system of classification, I think they are welcome to all Poor Law reformers in Ireland, and I hope they will be acceptable to this House.

This brings me to almost the only serious complaint I have to make of the Report of the Commission. I regret to find that they have not dealt, as I think, at all adequately with the important question of outdoor relief. As I stated in opening, they are mainly concerned with indoor relief, but, of course, that has a very important bearing on the other class of relief. The fact, which they admit, I think, though they do not sufficiently emphasise it, is that outdoor relief, which has been on the increase during the last twenty or thirty years, and is still increasing, is a very formidable matter, and I think we must be on our guard lest any changes now introduced should increase that tendency. The Commissioners are rather severe, in their introductory remarks, upon the way in which previous Commissions have ignored their predecessors, but I think that they in their turn might have followed the example of the last Committee which inquired into this question, and went most thoroughly and carefully into the subject of outdoor relief. They showed that it was then increasing, and warned the public and Parliament of what they had to expect. A great increase has taken place since the issue of that Report, and while indoor relief has remained practically stationary, outdoor relief has increased by 82 per cent., and I fear it is still increasing.

Some of the recommendations in the Report, such as the transfer of the aged and infirm to almshouses, one in each county, necessitating poor people having to go a much greater distance, must tend to increase outdoor relief. There are other suggestions for enabling widows with a single child to get outdoor relief, and also occupiers of a quarter of an acre. Both of these classes are excluded at present. Some authorities on the subject fear that those two provisions, especially the relaxation of the quarter-acre clause, might bring about a very large increase in outdoor relief. I think it will be admitted that if that result should unfortunately follow, and if outdoor relief should receive a very great stimulus and develop, even changes in the direction of better classification might be bought almost too dearly.

There is only one other matter to which I wish to allude before sitting down. The machinery which the Commissioners proposed, consequent on these considerable changes, would lead, as they themselves point out, to a considerable modification in the constitution, practice, and working of boards of guardians. Their duties would be very much reduced, and they would work rather by way of committees and by sending delegates to different joint boards representing a much larger area. The duties of boards of guardians would be very much curtailed, and that might have an effect upon the class of guardians elected, and it might also tend to reduce their efficiency. It might also tend to bring in more officials and more centralisation, which are dangers to be guarded against. I have thought it only right to call attention to these matters, which somewhat impair the high opinion I have entertained of the Report as a whole; but I wish again to repeat that this Report is, in my opinion, a valuable and weighty document, and I hope it will receive the attention of the Government with a view to immediate legislation.

Moved to resolve, "That, in the opinion of this House, the Irish Poor Law system demands the immediate attention of His Majesty's Government with a view to its reform."—(*Lord Monteagle of Brandon.*)

LORD CASTLETOWN: My Lords, I should like to associate myself with what has been said by my noble friend who has just sat down, than whom no one is more fitted to bring this subject to the attention of your Lordships. My noble friend has been for a number of years chairman of a voluntary association which has been engaged in looking into Poor Law questions, and he has rendered valuable service in mitigating some of the rigours of the present system. We have had a very exhaustive Report on this question, which is now quite ripe for settlement. This is no Party question; it is a social and economic question, and it is one which should be dealt with as rapidly as possible. The whole aspect of the Poor Law has changed since the time when it was first instituted, and the actual problems with which we are confronted now are totally different from those which then obtained. Now the question is undoubtedly far less complex, and it is possible to deal with it in a more humane manner.

The necessity has undoubtedly disappeared for keeping up huge workhouses. That, I think, is clearly shown by the Report, although the Commissioners do not advocate a reduction of the number of workhouses—that is, the actual destruction of them, but they suggest the utilisation of those workhouses for other purposes. I will not touch upon the four classes dealt with by my noble friend Lord Monteagle. The Commissioners are very clear as to what they advise should be done in those cases. I will take the other two classes—casuals and vagrants. I would divide them into three classes—the actual tramp; the deserving poor, who, from old age, infirmity, or ill-fortune, have failed in life and have no home; and those who have failed, also through no fault of their own, but have homes which they can maintain with the assistance of outdoor relief.

In the case of deserving poor who have homes of their own which they could maintain with the assistance of outdoor relief, it would be wise to allow them to continue in their homes. There is an equally deserving class who are homeless, and to send them to the poor-house to associate with some of the worst classes in Ireland is cruel, harsh, and unfair. These poor people deserve the greatest kindness. The suggestion of the Commission is a good one—that they should be sent to cottage homes, or what I should call homes of rest. We may be told that it would add enormously to the financial burden of the county or district if this recommendation were agreed to, but if His Majesty's Government would look into the question of the geographical distribution of the poor-houses they would find that, by utilising some of them for specific purposes—for homes of rest and for infirmaries—and by amalgamating others, the financial burden on the country would be lessened. I know of five poor-houses which are not more distant from each other than fifteen or sixteen miles. These five poor-houses could easily be reduced to one. In olden days these institutions were placed in districts in which starvation then existed and without any regard to the geographical position; but since then the change in the distribution of population has been enormous.

As to the tramps, the Report suggests that they should, in the first instance, be sent to working farms. In Holland that has been found most effective. I think also that good might result if the houses where the tramp could spend a night were as far apart as possible, so as to reduce to a minimum the amusement of walking from one poor-house to another. If they were ineffective I would certainly try the experiment of the working poor-house. It is sometimes useful to consider the remedies of our ancestors; and I think that in the case of incorrigible tramps we might consider the question of placing them in the stocks for an hour or two. If you make a man look eminently ridiculous it is often the last thing he wishes. I hope His Majesty's Government will deal with this problem as rapidly as possible. The matter is non-contentious. It is not a Party question; it is an economic and a social question. Many farmers and artisans suffer immensely from the presence of these tramps, and if next year the Government could bring in a Bill to deal with this evil it would be hailed with acclamation in nearly all the rural districts of Ireland.

*THE EARL OF MAYO: My Lords, the noble Earl who introduced this subject is better able to deal with it than anyone I know of in Ireland. He is the president of the Irish Workhouse Association; he has laboured in the cause of Poor Law reform, and has practical knowledge of the treatment of the poor in Irish workhouses. The Report of the Viceregal Commission and its recommendations are by some considered to be in a great measure Utopian. It is said that the recommendations are impossible to carry out, as the expense would be too great. No doubt exactly the same words were said of the Report of the Irish Royal Commissioners in 1836. It is almost uncanny to read some of the recommendations of that Commission, and to see how they have come to pass. That Commission, seventy years ago, recommended land drainage and reclamation on modern lines, the provision of labourers' cottages and allotments, the bringing of agricultural instruction to the doors of the peasant, the improvement of land tenure, the transfer of fiscal powers from Grand Juries to county boards, the employment of direct labour on roads by such county boards, the sending of vagrants to colonies to be employed there or to penitentiaries, the closing of public-houses on Sundays, and the prevention of the sale of groceries and intoxicating drink in the same house for consumption on the premises. Your Lordships will recognise that nearly all these recommendations have been carried out. Those Commissioners well and truly understood the requirements of the country, and yet it has taken more than two generations to carry out many of those reforms. I trust we may move with more celerity nowadays.

To take the Viceregal Report, I admit that it is impossible to deal at once with all its recommendations. I shall not attempt to go into all of them, for your Lordships will admit that the sweeping assertion that the present workhouse system should be abolished cannot be carried out at once. We all know that the "taint of the union," as it is called, is dreaded by the poor, and if we cannot remove it altogether we can at least deal with the young, the children, and remove them from the atmosphere and surroundings of a poor-house. This can be done by the boarding-out system, of which I have had some experience in my own county. The Pauper Children (Ireland) Act, 1898, allows the boarding-out of any orphan or deserted child up to the age of fifteen, subject to the discretion of the guardians. This system has been adopted by twenty-eight unions in Ireland with signal success, and ladies' committees have been appointed by boards of guardians to visit the boarded-out children to see that they are properly looked after and cared for. I cannot do better than quote the reasons given in favour of boarding out children. The Commissioners state that the considerations in favour of this system are—

> "(*a*) The wish of the majority, as indicated by the weight of evidence, is strongly in favour of it; (*b*) The general opinion is that institution-reared children, when put out in the world to work for themselves, are not handy, as they have been too much used to having things done for them, and owing to the natural division of labour in a large institution they have had experience of only certain portions of work; (*c*) Not being used to small houses and to commonplace life, but to clockwork arrangements and to spacious rooms with suitable furniture and fittings, institution-reared children are found to be awkward and out of their element when placed among ordinary surroundings in the houses of the poor; (*d*) Children reared in institutions are thought to be not as tough or hardy as children brought up in ordinary houses in the country; (*e*) Children in workhouses are frequently contaminated and debased by their parents and by their association with disreputable inmates."

In mentioning institutions I am dealing this evening with workhouses only, not reformatry schools or industrial schools. Boarding-out is, in the opinion of the Commissioners, by far the best and cheapest mode of rearing children During the financial year on which the Commissioners base their calculation a workhouse child cost about £18 9s. 4d., while a boarded-out child cost on an average £8 10s. a year in some good unions, including an average allowance of £1 10s. yearly for clothing. The Commissioners add—

> "We think that, allowing for desirable improvements in the system, the cost of a boarded-out child might be put down at £10 a year, including clothing."

It will be seen from these figures that if boarding-out were generally adopted for workhouse children there would be saved the difference between £18 9s. 4d. and £10 per annum, which latter sum is estimated as a very generous allowance for a boarded-out child. There would also be a saving of £9,108 per annum which is paid out of a Parliamentary Grant for the salaries of workhouse teachers, as where the children are boarded out they would go to the National schools. Your Lordships will remember that the Act of 1898 only allows the boarding-out of an orphan or deserted child. The Viceregal Commission received evidence in the shape of 100 witnesses in favour of empowering the local Poor Law authority to board out all above the age of infancy, or even during infancy in special cases. I trust your Lordships will allow, and the Government will admit, that I have made out a case for boarding-out and removing the children from the tainted atmosphere of the poor-house.

I pass from this to the prevalence of tuberculosis in Ireland. It is no use enlarging upon the terrors of the "white plague," but I would briefly state that during the past thirty-five years the death rate from this disease in England has been reduced by one-half and in Scotland by almost the same extent, but in Ireland the deaths from tuberculosis for the year 1904 were 12,694; and I would emphasise the fact that in 1905 there were 8,204 patients suffering from this disease and being treated in the union hospitals and county infirmaries—institutions quite unsuitable for the treatment of such patients. Surely it is better to prevent people from taking the disease than to try and cure them when it has begun. In the greater part of Ireland the only hospital accommodation is the union infirmary, and owing to the want of suitable accommodation the consumptive poor in the early stages do not care to enter the infirmary. In the majority of the union infirmaries there are separate wards, but with few exceptions these are only partially isolated, the patients using the same passages, staircases, and exercise wards; while in some even this partial isolation has not been provided, although the infectious nature of the disease and the necessity for isolation are well known. In fact, these infirmaries are centres of infection, where patients go in to linger and die, and where the other inmates are exposed day by day to the risk of catching this deadly disease. I consider this a horrible state of affairs.

There are two public sanatoria in Ireland for dealing with this disease and some private ones, but there is no reason why some of the disused workhouses could not with reasonable outlay be converted into fairly suitable sanatoria. At least the dangers of infection would then be removed from the infirmaries. Two or three counties might join together and build a properly equipped sanatorium for their consumptives, and if that were done it would spread the cost over a large area. These suggestions, if carried out—and they are suggestions of the Commission—would enable consumptives in the early stages to make use of these sanatoria instead of dreading to enter the infirmaries until too late; it would remove infection from the cottages where still many are crowded together; and it would show the poorer people that the deadly nature of the disease was recognised by the proper authorities. Cures could be affected in the earlier stages of the malady and the patient enabled to return to his work. I would ask the Government to give the authorities power to deal with these matters, which constitute only a very small item in the programme and recommendations of the Commissioners. If power were given, I feel certain that public opinion would do the rest, and these reforms would gradually and surely be carried out.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: My Lords, I think it must be rather a matter for regret to noble Lords from Ireland, as it is to myself, that a question of this kind, which we must all agree is of the very first importance, should have to be dealt with in so thin a House—one that compares so unfavourably with the sort of House which we sometimes see when the question, perhaps, of police measures in Ireland is under review. I most heartily join in everything that has been said as to the complete fitness of my noble friend on the cross benches to bring forward this question. I well know how conversant he is with it, and how devotedly he has laboured on these matters.

Speaking on the general question I think we must all agree with the noble Earl opposite that nothing could be more striking than the manner in which the recommendations of the Royal Commission of 1836 have gradually been accepted. It speaks much for the foresight of the eminent gentlemen who composed that Commission, but what I am afraid it does not speak quite so highly for is the foresight of the English statesmen of that day, gentlemen like Sir George Cornewall Lewis, who possessed one of the most remarkable intellects ever placed at the service of politics in this country, but who, as the representative of the *laisser faire* school pure and simple, fell into the error which many politicians did at that time of imagining that there was only one set of lines on which all legislation should be conducted. It is ironically painful to read in this Report an account of how an English civil servant visited Ireland and came back at the end of six weeks with a cut and dried scheme to wipe out absolutely the greater part of the recommendations of the gentlemen who sat on that Commission. One notes in the statement of Sir G. Nicholls the extraordinary complacency with which in 1853 he pointed out that there were no beggars left in Ireland, the circumstances that they had all been starved to death years before in the great famine, or had died of the disease which accompanied that famine, being ignored.

The Report of the Viceregal Commission contains forty-three separate recommendations, of which thirty-six could be carried into effect only by legislation, while seventeen of them are most highly contentious. That leaves seven matters which could be more or less dealt with by administration. On the question of legislation I am bound to say at once that I do not think it would be right to hold out to my noble friend any hope that the subject is likely to be dealt with by a Bill next year. The very scope and size of the question naturally make it infinitely more difficult to deal with, and if we were to adopt the suggestion of the noble Earl who has just sat down that we should deal with one or two matters in connection with it, the question would arise as to what matter should be dealt with. My noble friend spoke of boarding-out; on the other hand, Lord Castletown would no doubt have us deal with tramps and vagrants; and so on. Therefore I do not like to hold out any promise at all to my noble friend, for I am afraid there is very little, if any, chance of the matter being legislatively dealt with next session.

The noble Lord who initiated this discussion, and also Lord Castletown, spoke in a very interesting manner about classification in workhouses. This is a subject which applies not only to Ireland but to the United Kingdom at large, and it is one on which public opinion has ripened to a great extent. Everybody agrees that it is monstrous that people of all ages and of every degree of desert should be huddled and herded together. But classification must always mean some, and, occasionally, considerable, extra expense. The placing of all hospitals under county committees would also require legislation. As to the treatment of lunatics, it has always been a matter of regret that so many lunatics in Ireland have been housed in the workhouses; and I am not surprised to find that with regard to children the Commissioners speak very highly of boarding out. I was for some years chairman of an English society—the State Children's Association—which has urged on boards of guardians the adoption of one of three methods—emigration, boarding out, and scattered homes in which not more than a dozen children are placed under the care of a foster mother. All those plans have been found to answer well in England. Obviously emigration is not a method we want to apply to Ireland in this connection. We should be very glad if all these children could be well brought up at home and become useful citizens; but, as regards boarding-out, I personally was a little surprised to find that it seemed to be regarded by the Commissioners as the sole and only method of dealing with these children in Ireland. In the towns, at least, I should have thought the scattered homes system would have proved as successful as in England.

Then my noble friend Lord Castletown made a very interesting speech about tramps; but, of course, he must be aware, that the whole question of forcibly dealing with vagrants and placing them in labour colonies is one which, though many think it has a good deal to recommend it, has not yet been acted upon in this country, and we know there are two very distinct schools of opinion upon it. I should be sorry to foretell the amount of Parliamentary time that would be required for a Bill dealing with all these questions. Then there is the question of outdoor relief. The Commissioners recommend the repeal of the quarter-acre occupation limit as a standard for out-door relief, but I am inclined to think that the Local Government Board of Ireland would be disposed to look with some dismay on any proposition of that kind. Outdoor relief is certainly a dangerous toy to play with, and the greatest possible consideration would be necessary before any attempt was made to deal with that side of the question.

The Commissioners next suggest that the area for outdoor relief should in future be the electoral division and not the union, and that the guardians should be empowered to strike a special rate for the purpose. That, again, seems to be a very difficult proposition. One hears of a dog being fed with his own tail and it does seem as though this were rather a similar operation, because some of the electoral divisions are very small, and the effect of rating them specially might be disastrous. I note that the Commissioners regard with approval the very interesting Report on Local Taxation of 1902. The propositions contained in that Report have always been regarded as exceedingly weighty, but it has not yet been found possible to give effect to them here; and equally the proposition that they should be included in a sort of omnibus Local Government Bill for Ireland seems to present very great difficulty indeed.

As regards this question of boundaries, upon which the Commissioners have some interesting paragraphs towards the end of their Report, it is perfectly true that no legislation for those matters would be needed; but one difficulty is this, that the Report does not contain any forecast as to what the financial results to each particular district would be if these changes in boundaries were adopted. If the localities desired that these changes should be made the Local Government Board would be perfectly willing to act upon their recommendations and suggestions; but it clearly would be necessary, first, that each local authority should hold a very careful preliminary inquiry with the special object of finding out what the precise financial effect would be, and how the charges would fall on the different districts as re-arranged. When that is done, the Local Government Board will give most careful consideration to the proposals involved.

The noble Earl Lord Mayo referred to the question of tuberculosis. No legislation is required, of course, for the erection of the sanatoria suggested; that is an administrative act, and if the localities moved in the matter the Local Government Board would no doubt raise no objection. The question of cost is an important element, and the suggestion that in some cases existing buildings might be utilised is well worth bearing in mind. My noble friend Lord Castletown referred to the rougher method adopted by our grandfathers of placing incorrigible tramps in the stocks; I am afraid public opinion at this day is hardly likely to acquiesce in the revival of the stocks or the pillory, but, of course, it is open to my noble friend to start a crusade on the subject. I am sorry we have not been able to give brighter hopes of legislation, but I can assure the House that the Government, and particularly the Chief Secretary, are fully alive to the remarkable character of this Report and its great importance, and that we have a real desire to deal with the subject as soon as possible. My noble friend will understand from what I have said that it is not possible for us to agree to his Motion in the terms in which it is placed on the Paper, because the acceptance of the words "immediate attention" would imply that we intended to legislate next session. But if he would modify the words in some way we should be happy to accept the Motion.

THE EARL OF MEATH: My Lords, although the noble Earl has stated that His Majesty's Government cannot see their way to pass legislation on this subject next year, I think we may congratulate the noble Lord who brought forward this Motion on having obtained, I will not say an assurance, but at all events an expression of opinion, from the noble Earl that as far as improvements can be affected in the Poor Law without legislative sanction he is willing to go to that extent as regards classification.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I think the noble Earl has stated it rather too broadly. I merely desired to point out the matters on which improvements could be effected without legislation, but, of course, the question of cost must govern those as it does the others.

THE EARL OF MEATH: I understand that as far as possible His Majesty's Government are willing, as regards classification, to introduce reforms in Ireland. Looking through the forty-three recommendations of the Commission I have picked out the most important. They are seven in number, and of them four, I think, would come under the heading of classification—namely, the removal of insane to asylums, the separation of sane epileptics from insane, the segregation of aged and infirm, and the boarding-out of children. These subjects all come under the heading of classification, and we therefore get a very long way towards what we reformers have desired for many years. I am exceedingly glad to hear that there is to be some improvement in our poor law, because this subject has been very near the hearts of all, irrespective of politics, who have taken an interest in the social condition of Ireland. It is most gratifying that no discordant note has been struck, and that there is one question connected with Ireland on which we can all agree. With regard to the treatment of tramps, some valuable hints are afforded by the methods adopted in several countries on the Continent. I do not say that we should go the full length of what Germany has done, but I do think that if those connected with the Department which deals with the Poor Law in Ireland would consider what Germany has done, some valuable hints might be forthcoming.

LORD ASHBOURNE: My Lords, I think that a very useful purpose has been served by this debate, and I do not think, considering the really large topics involved and the period of the session, a more sympathetic or conciliatory answer could have been expected than that which has been given by the noble Earl the Lord President. He showed that he had considered the Report, and had examined it with a view to realising the importance of the topics dealt with as well as their complexity and difficulty. It is pleasant to find that there are some subjects that can be approached without any difference of opinion from the political side. There are very few subjects in Ireland of which this can be said. It is manifest from the debate that though there are several topics on which there is almost all-round agreement, there are others to which that observation cannot apply; and many of the wider questions would require legislation, and would certainly require a substantial amount of expenditure. But what we may expect is that His Majesty's Government will apply themselves, at as early a date as possible, to a consideration of the recommendations in the Report, with an earnest desire to give both administrative and legislative relief, and will consider whether they can see their way to frame a Bill which would be likely to meet with very general acceptance. I would suggest, in view of what the noble Earl stated, that my noble friend should substitute the word "early" in the Motion for the word "immediate," which is a less drastic word, and one which the Government will no doubt accept. What is desired is that at as early a date as circumstances will admit the matter shall be dealt with. I do not think there is any reason for noble Lords to be dissatisfied with the discussion that has taken place.

LORD DENMAN: My Lords, we are at one on the main question. We are all agreed that this is an admirable Report, that it contains many valuable and excellent suggestions, and that legislation must be undertaken to amend or reform the Poor Law of Ireland; and we are grateful to the noble Lord on the cross benches for having raised this question, because the more public attention is drawn to it so much the more are the hands of the Government of Ireland strengthened in the matter. I am not sure whether the noble Earl Lord Meath was correct in saying that certain matters of classification could be carried out without legislation. I understand that the case of the segregation of inmates in separate institutions requires legislation, and that the placing of the aged and infirm in disused workhouses would also require legislation. One reason why it would be impossible for His Majesty's Government to introduce legislation next session is that there is at present sitting a Royal Commission upon Poor Law and Unemployed. It will be necessary for that Commission to consider the recommendations made in this Report, and the Government must wait for some expression of opinion from that Commission. If my noble friend Lord Monteagle will consent to the substitution of the word "early" for "immediate," the Government will accept his Motion as stating that the subject "demands the early attention of the Government."

LORD MONTEAGLE OF BRANDON: I am quite willing to adopt the suggestion of my noble and learned friend Lord Ashbourne, and to substitute the word "early" for the word "immediate," as that appears to meet with the approval of His Majesty's Government.

On Question, Motion, as amended, agreed to.

INJURED ANIMALS ACT (1894) AMENDMENT BILL.

House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª to-morrow.

PUBLIC HEALTH (SCOTLAND) AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to amend Sections 57, 58, and 59 of the Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1897, relating to the prevention of infectious diseases. Was presented by the Lord Hamilton of Dalzell; read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Wednesday, the 31st instant. (No. 127.)

VACCINATION (SCOTLAND) BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to amend the law with respect to vaccination in Scotland by authorising a statutory declaration of conscientious objection. Was presented by the Lord Hamilton of Dalzell; read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Thursday, the 1st of August next. (No. 128.)

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: Before the House adjourns I should like to ask the noble Lord who has just introduced these two Scottish Bills whether he will allow as long an interval as possible before taking the Second Reading stage. I do not, of course, propose to ask what are the contents of the Bills at this stage; but anything in the nature of an amendment of the vaccination law will probably be controversial. I hope that adequate time will be allowed before the next stage is taken.

LORD HAMILTON OF DALZELL: I had intended to ask the House to take the Second Reading of these Bills on Monday and Tuesday of next week, but if it would meet the view of the noble Lord I would be content to put them off until Wednesday and Thursday of next week. These Bills are now being introduced for the first time—they have not passed through the House of Commons—and as the session is advancing I hope there will not be undue delay.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: Even the extended time does not afford sufficient opportunity to communicate with persons in Scotland on points that might be involved; but I will not press for any further delay at the present time.

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Eight o'clock, till to-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 22nd July, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table, Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]; Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time to-morrow.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL [LORDS] (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table, Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz.:—Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow.

London and North Western Railway Bill; Penrith Urban District Council Bill; Worthing Gas Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Alton Military Hospital Bill [Lords]; Electric Supply Corporation Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Sheffield Corporation Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Coventry Corporation Bill [Lords]; Humber Conservancy Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Oxford and District Tramways Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill.—Read the third time, and passed.

Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill (by Order).—Read the third time and passed.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP K).

MR. ARTHUR STANLEY reported from the Committee on Group K of Private Bills; That the parties opposing the Birkenhead Corporation Water Bill [Lords] had stated that the evidence of Arthur Caradoc Williams, Acting Conservator of the River Dee, was essential to their case; and, it having been proved that his attendance could not be procured without the intervention of the House, he had been instructed to move that the said Arthur Caradoc Williams do attend the said Committee To-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Ordered, That the said Arthur Caradoc Williams do attend the said Committee on Group K of Private Bills To-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Merthyr Tydfil Stipendiary Justice Bill [Lords].—Reported with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to: Limited Partnerships Bill; British North America Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders, made by the Board of Trade under the General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Fleetwood, Portsmouth, and Sennen." [Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords.]

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 283.]

PETITIONS.

WEEKLY REST-DAY BILL.

Petitions in favour: From Clerkenwell and other places; and, Newcastle-on Tyne and other places; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3862 to 3867 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

WINTER ASSIZES ACTS, 1876 AND 1877.

Copies presented, of Seven Orders in Council, dated 6th July, 1907, relating to the ensuing Winter Assizes [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894.

Copies presented, of Order in Council, dated 6th July, 1907, providing that Buckie shall be a place of registry for Sea Fishing Boats [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

EXTRADITION ACTS, 1870 TO 1906.

Copies presented, of Orders in Council, dated 6th July, 1907, (1) for giving effect to a Supplementary Convention between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and the Kingdom of Belgium for the mutual surrender of fugitive criminals; (2) for giving effect to an Agreement concluded between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and the Kingdom of Norway for the mutual surrender of fugitive criminals; (3) ordering that the operation of the Extradition Acts, 1870 to 1906, shall be suspended within the Dominion of Canada so long as Part I. of Chapter 155 of The Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, shall continue in force [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.

Copy presented, of Orders in Council, dated 6th July, 1907, (1) providing for the Government of Cyprus; (2) entitled The Ashanti Order in Council, 1907; (3) entitled The Northern Territories Order in Council, 1907; (4) entitled The Nyasaland Order in Council, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

BRITISH SETTLEMENTS ACT, 1887, AND FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.

Copies presented, of Orders in Council, dated 6th July, 1907, entitled: (1) The Pacific Order in Council, 1907; (2) The Pacific Islands Civil Marriages Order in Council, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVAL AND MARINE PAY AND PENSIONS ACT, 1865.

Copies presented, of Orders in Council, dated 6th July, 1907, approving Memorials of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty praying sanction to: (1) An Amendment of the Regulations so as to provide that officers appointed to a surveying ship commissioned at Home for service Abroad shall draw surveying pay from the date of joining the ship; (2) the payment of certain allowances to Naval and Marine officers studying Chinese in China; (3) certain modifications in the conditions of service of officers' servants; (4) a new scale of allowances to lamp-trimmers on board His Majesty's ships [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

GREENWICH HOSPITAL ACT, 1865.

Copy presented, of Order in Council, dated 6th July, 1907, authorising a higher scale of salary for the Director of Greenwich Hospital [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

CONGESTION IN IRELAND (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Copy presented, of Fifth Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into and report upon the operation of the Acts dealing with Congestion in Ireland, with Appendix (Minutes of Evidence taken in London, 12th to 28th March, and Documents relating thereto) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SUGAR.

Return ordered, "showing as far as possible, for each of the years 1887 to 1906, inclusive, the estimated production of cane and beet sugar, respectively, in the various producing countries of the world; the imports and exports of raw and refined sugar, distinguishing beet and other sorts, into and from the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Holland, the United States, Canada, and Australia, from and to the principal countries of origin and destination; the total consumption and consumption per head of the population of each of the above-named countries; and the exports of sugar of domestic production from each of the principal British Colonies and Possessions, together with the average declared import value of raw and refined sugar for the United Kingdom (in continuation of similar particulars contained in Parliamentary Paper, No. 353, of Session 1888)."—(*Mr. Mitchell-Thomson.*)

IMPORT AND EXPORT TRADE (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Report on the Trade in Imports and Exports at Irish Ports during the year ended 31st December, 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

IRISH RAILWAYS (VICEREGAL COMMISSION).

Copy presented, of First Report of the Commissioners, with Appendix [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (RAILWAYS).

Copy presented, of Administrative Report on the Railways in India for the year 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

OSBORNE.

Copy presented, of Report by the House Governor and Medical Superintendent at Osborne for the year ending 31st March, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CIVIL SERVICES (SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1907–8).

Estimate presented, of the Further Sums required to be voted for the Service of the year ending 31st March, 1908 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 263.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Bass Rock Valuation.

MR. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire): To ask the Secretary for Scotland with reference to the valuation for rating at £31 a year of the house and land at Canty Bay, including the Bass Rock, how much of that valuation is attributable to the house and land at Canty Bay and how much to the Bass Rock; whether that valuation now includes the portion of the Bass Rock which has been feued by the Northern Lights Commissioners; and, if that portion of the Bass Rock is valued separately, what is the amount of such valuation.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I am unable to say how much of the valuation is attributable to the Bass Rock and how much to the remainder of the holding. The ground feued to the Northern Lighthouse Commissioners is not included in the sum mentioned by my hon. friend. The lighthouse does not appear on the roll.

Naval Medical Inspections.

MR. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty by whose authority the monthly medical inspection of crews belonging to torpedo boats and destroyers is carried out on board the parent ships at home ports; for what reason was it initiated, and could instructions be issued so that all chief petty officers, when undergoing or preparing for this inspection, may have screened off for their separate use places apart from that used by seamen and stokers.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) (1) By the direction of the Admiralty in 1904. (2) It was found that in many cases men suffering from disease when drafted to destroyers did not present themselves for treatment until absolutely unable to continue duty. It was to prevent the consequent aggravation and spread of disease, and to ensure early medical treatment, that the monthly medical inspection was instituted. (3) Directions were given by the Admiralty in 1906 that petty officers should be treated with every consideration in the matter of this medical examination. When attending with men they are to be seen first. If required to strip, facilities are to be afforded for them to do so in privacy. The ports were informed at the same time that it was desirable that each petty officer and man, when stripped, should be examined separately.

Training Colleges.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone): To ask the President of the Board of Education if he will state the names of the local education authorities proposing to establish training colleges, and the accommodation to be afforded in each case.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) Schemes for the provision of ten training colleges have been received from local education authorities, and are now under consideration by the Board. In seven other cases the provision of a college is known to be under discussion by the local authority, but no definite proposals have been submitted to the Board. Inasmuch as many of these schemes are in a very early stage of preparation, and in some cases the Board have been requested by the local authority to regard the information as confidential for financial reasons, I am unable at present to give the names of the authorities concerned.

Irish Estate Duty.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that, in the case of the estate of William Humphrys, deceased, which comprises lands agreements for the sale of which to the tenants have been made under the Irish Land Act of 1903 but not completed, the Secretary of Estates Duties in Ireland has refused to accept payment of the estate duty by instalments; and whether, seeing that the person succeeding to this property is only receiving interest on the prchase money pending the completion of the sale, he will consent to a delay of the payment of the estate duty in full until the purchase money is paid over by the Land Commission.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The Commissioners of Inland Revenue have discretion, under Section 8, Sub-section 9, of The Finance Act, 1894, where they are satisfied that the estate duty leviable in respect of any property cannot without excessive sacrifice be raised at once, to allow payment to be postponed for such period, to such extent, and on payment of such interest not exceeding 4 per cent. or any higher interest yielded by the property, and on such terms as the Commissioners think fit. Any representations which may be made to the Commissioners in that sense, in the case to which the hon. Member refers, will receive careful consideration.

Tea Duty in Ireland.

MR. LEVERTON HARRIS (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the average contribution per head of the population of Ireland towards the duty levied upon tea during the year ending 31st March, 1907, exceeded the average contribution of 2s. 6·72d. per head paid during this period by the population of the United Kingdom; and, if so, by how much.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) It is estimated that the average contribution per head of the population of Ireland towards the duty paid on tea during the year ended 31st March, 1907, was 2s. 6·20d., being ·52d. less than that paid per head of the population of the United Kingdom.

Corn Duty.

MR. LEVERTON HARRIS: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what revenue was obtained during the last twelve months that it was in operation from the 1s. a quarter registration duty on imported corn; how much of this revenue was derived from corn and flour imported from foreign countries, as apart from British possessions; and what was the average contribution per head of the population of the United Kingdom towards the revenue obtained from imported foreign corn and flour during this period.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The net revenue obtained from the duty on corn, etc., during the twelve months ended 30th June, 1903, was £1,876,664, and of this sum it is estimated that £1,565,076 was derived from corn, etc., imported from foreign countries. The average contribution per head of the population of the United Kingdom towards the revenue obtained from imported foreign corn, etc., during the period is thus 8·86d.

MR. LEVERTON HARRIS: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what was the amount of revenue collected upon the 73,658,936 cwts. of wheat and the 20,440,827 cwts. of wheatmeal and flour, mentioned in the Annual Abstract of Trade [Cd. 3466] as having been imported into the United Kingdom from foreign countries during the operation of the Corn Tax in 1902 and 1903; and what was the average annual contribution per head of the population of the United Kingdom towards this revenue.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The estimated net revenue collected upon wheat and wheat flour imported into the United Kingdom from foreign countries between the 15th April, 1902, and the 30th June, 1903, inclusive, was as follows—

	£
Wheat - - -	787,829
Wheat flour - -	379,436

The average annual contribution per head of the population of the United Kingdom towards this revenue was—

Wheat - - -	3.70d.
Wheat flour - -	1 78d.

Indian Rupee Coinage.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): To ask the Secretary of State for India if he will state the amount of silver rupees coined during 1906 on which the seignorage profit of £4,000,000 sterling was realised; and the average price per ounce at which the metal was purchased.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) In the financial year 1906–7 (in which a net profit of £4,000,000 was realised on the coinage of rupees) the number of rupees coined, excluding the recoinage of old rupees, was 227,670,000 (*i.e.*, 22 crores 76¾ lakhs=£15,180,000). The average price per ounce at which silver was purchased during the year was 31·332 pence.

Plague Inoculation in India.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether inoculation for the plague continues to be practised in India in general and the Punjab in particular.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) In all provinces inoculation is offered to the people, and is performed free of charge by the district medical staff. In the Punjab of late it has been accepted by increasing numbers. In April last over 21,000 persons were inoculated in that province. The extent to which the remedy is used must necessarily rest with the people themselves, as no one is inoculated against his will.

Irish School Building Grants.

MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in the event of the new annual grant of £40,000 for school buildings in Ireland falling short of the demands upon it, and where the local parties in poor districts are raising money for enlargements of non-vested schools, building class-rooms, or making other structural improvements, the Commissioners of Education will be empowered to make grants out of the £40,000 to assist local parties when such assistance is needed.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The £40,000 alluded to in the Question is provided for the building and improvement of vested school houses. No provision is made for the building and improvement of non-vested school houses, and consequently the Commissioners of National Education have no power to make grants in such cases. Loans, however, are made for the erection, enlargement, or improvement of non-vested school houses.

Kilmeedy School, Limerick.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say what has been the average number of children in daily attendance for the last twelve months in the boys' and girls' schools, respectively, at Kilmeedy, in County Limerick; what has been the tenor of the inspectors' reports for the last three years on these schools; in what category, excellent, very good, good, fair, have these schools been placed by the Commissioners of National Education; has either of them got any special distinction for efficiency, and, if so, what is that distinction; and whether it is with a view to the further efficiency of these schools or on grounds of thrift that the Treasury overrides the judgment of the Commissioners of National Education, and insists that they shall be maintained in their present unsatisfactory condition or broken up altogether and amalgamated.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The average attendance at Kilmeedy boys' school during the twelve months ending 30th June last was thirty-nine, and at the girls' school sixty-two. The inspectors' reports upon both schools for the past three years were very favourable, and the schools were placed in categories ranging from good to excellent. In 1903 the principal teacher of the girls' school was awarded one of the Carlisle and Blake premiums, as being one of the most deserving teachers under the Board. I have already informed the hon. Member of the reason why the existing rule as to building grants for separate boys' and girls' schools must be maintained. The amalgamation of small schools in Ireland is considered to be a pressing necessity in the interests both of efficiency and of economy.

Irish Evicted Tenants.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can supply an estimate of the ages of the evicted tenants whom it is proposed to replace upon the land and who have been described as having been out in the cold for over twenty-eight years, living in insanitary huts by the side of their old holdings.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I have no information which would enable me to make the estimate suggested in the Question.

Tottenham Estate Evicted Tenant.

MR. P. A. McHUGH (Sligo, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that an evicted farm at Aughavanny, near Kiltyclogher, county Leitrim, on the Tottenham estate, from which a man named James Fox was evicted seven years ago, has been for a considerable time in the occupation of emergency men, who merely act as caretakers; whether the receiver of the estate, Mr. Maude, has expressed his readiness to reinstate Mr. Fox; and can he say what steps, if any, the Estates Commissioners have taken to restore this evicted tenant to his holding, which is now vacant.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The estate to which the Question refers is for sale in the Land Judge's Court. The farm from which James Fox was evicted is in the possession of caretakers. The receiver of the estate informed Fox that if he should offer a fair price his re-instatement would be considered; but the offer made by Fox was considered inadequate. The Estates Commissioners are considering the question of making an offer for the purchase of the estate, and if they should acquire it they will deal with Fox's application for reinstatement.

Mullaghmore Fish-curing Station.

MR. P. A. McHUGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any steps have been taken recently to establish fish-curing stations on the sea coast of Sligo; and can he say when the promised station at Mullaghmore will be started.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Congested Districts Board do not consider it necessary or desirable in the interests of the fishermen to establish fish-curing stations on the coast of Sligo. There are many buyers of fish on that coast, and the Board are of opinion that it would be to the disadvantage of the fishermen if the Board should enter into competition with the merchants and cause them to leave the district. The hon. Member is mistaken in supposing that the Board promised to establish a curing station at Mullaghmore.

Sligo Fishing Industry.

MR. P. A. McHUGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, since 1892, the Congested Districts Board expended £66,626 on piers, slips, and harbour works in the six maritime congested districts counties in Ireland, and that only £735 of that sum was expended in Sligo on such works; whether he is aware that the development of the fishing industry along the seaboard of the county of Sligo had been rendered almost impossible owing to the want of piers, slips, and harbours; can he explain why the fishing industry in this county was so much neglected by the Congested Districts Board; and is he aware that a small pier, which was commenced some time ago at Ballyconnell, on the Magherow coast of county Sligo, remains in a half-finished condition, and that the work has been stopped.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The amounts stated to have been expended by the Congested Districts Board are correct, except that the Board are now constructing a landing-place at Knocklane, county Sligo, at a cost of £300, of which sum they are providing £200. They have also issued eighty-two loans to Sligo fishermen amounting in all to £774. The Board have been unremitting in their attention to the wants of the fisheries on the coast of Sligo. The extent of seaboard is very small, and owing to the physical features of the coast, the fisheries must necessarily be of very limited value. At the last census the number of fishermen in county Sligo was only 167. It is not the fact that the Board commenced a pier at Ballyconnell. Their work at that place consisted in removing, at a cost of £141, some stones which were thrown up by the storm.

United Irish League Officials and Evicted Farms.

MR. LONSDALE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will ascertain from the constabulary, in continuation of information given a few years ago on the same subject, the number of grazing farms and evicted farms held respectively by presidents and vice-presidents, secretaries, treasurers, and members of the committees of the United Irish League.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I have nothing to add to the Answer which I gave to the hon. Member's similar Question on the 15th instant, namely, that the Government have no information on this subject and do not propose to make inquiries in the matter.

Reinforced Concrete at Woolwich.

MR. WHITEHEAD (Essex, S.E.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether reinforced concrete has been used by his Department for constructional purposes at Woolwich or elsewhere; and, if so, whether the work has been applied above ground or in foundations; whether it has given satisfaction; whether it has been found economical; whether the War Office have experienced any accidents in the execution of the work; and what is the date of the earliest instance of such work executed for his Department.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Reinforced concrete has been employed to a considerable extent in construction both at Woolwich Dockyard and at Woolwich Arsenal. This material has been made use of in foundations, in piling, and above ground, and is considered to be satisfactory and economical. No accidents have been experienced either during execution or since occupation. The first instance of its use there was in the construction of a storehouse at Woolwich Dockyard, erected between October, 1904, and September, 1905. In addition to the above reinforced con-concrete has been employed in the construction of a roof and stairway in Cairo in 1905, and was found economical and satisfactory.

Yeomanry Arms.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether a decision has been arrived at respecting the re-arming of the Yeomanry; and whether they are to be armed with the sword and short rifle as in the Regular Cavalry.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) it is not at present contemplated to arm the Yeomanry with the sword. The short rifle and sword bayonet will be issued to them.

Civil Service Pensions.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, if one man joins the Civil Service at the age of nineteen, and another joins the Army at the same age and obtains, on his discharge at the age of twenty-six, a Civil Service appointment, and both men, their total service to the State being equal, are superannuated at the age of sixty, the first man, whose service has been entirely civil, receives the maximum pension of forty-sixtieths of his total salary, while the other man, not being able to count his military service, receives only thirty-four sixtieths of his total salary; and, if this is so, whether, in view of the fact that the man who gives military service to the State undertakes far greater responsibilities and dangers, military service will be allowed to count towards pension.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Will the hon. Baronet kindly refer to the reply given by the Financial Secretary to the Treasury to a Question put on this subject on 15th May, by the hon. Member for Shoreditch ?†

St. Helena Police.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies why only five native policemen are considered sufficient for the protection of St. Helena; and what special provision is made to deal with a possible insurrection.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The police force of St. Helena is adequate to deal with the small amount of petty crime which exists, and it is not thought necessary to make any special provision for dealing with such a contingency as that suggested.

St. Helena Fortifications.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will consider the advisability of sending the Cape or South American squadrons to St. Helena and using it as a training ground, and thus keeping the present fortifications, upon which hundreds of thousands of pounds have been spent, and which would assist the Colony and prevent the buildings being ruined.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The Admiralty have recently arranged for three ships proceeding to or from the Cape station to call at St. Helena. I have reason to believe these visits have assisted the Colony financially. I can, however, give no pledge as to the frequency of such visits in future, as they must depend upon naval requirements.

St. Helena Farmers' Troubles.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if any steps have been taken to compensate the farmers and landowners of St. Helena, who, acting on the advice of Crown officials, invested their all in cattle and land in order to provide for the troops, now withdrawn, the result of which has been ruin to farmers.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) There is no official record of any advice given by Crown officials in the sense indicated in the hon. Member's Question; therefore, while sympathising with the difficulties in which the farmers find themselves, His Majesty's Government have not felt able to deal with their case differently from that of other members of the community.

St. Helena Magistrate's Salary.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that Mr. J. Homagee, I.S.O., magistrate in St. Helena, has been reduced in salary by £30 after having completed forty years' service, and was entitled to a pension on his previous salary; whether, in view of the fact that this official remaining on active service is a saving of £400, he can say why his salary has been reduced; and if he will take action to have it restored.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) Mr. Homagee's salary was reduced at the beginning of this year, together with others, under a necessary scheme of retrenchment. Until the finances of St. Helena show a marked improvement it will be impossible to restore his and other salaries to their former figures, but Mr. Homagee has been promised that when the time comes for his retirement, his pension will be calculated on his previous and not on his present emoluments.

Legal Appeals in St. Helena.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that, in the event of the Governor of St. Helena acting illegally, the person or persons injured have no opportunity of obtaining an appeal unless able to deposit a large sum of money before such appeal will be allowed; and whether, in view of this fact, he will consider the advisability of reducing the amount of deposit in order that the poorer classes may have the protection of the higher court.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxiv., 957.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The fee to be paid on petition from the Supreme Court of St. Helena to the Privy Council is £5, which cannot be considered prohibitive in the case of persons able to afford the other expenses of such an appeal. The Supreme Court is empowered to require security to be given for costs, etc., before an appeal is allowed, and the Secretary of State does not think it would be wise to dispense with this.

Employees' Insurance in British Central Africa.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that British insurance companies decline to insure employees engaged in this country for service in British Central Africa owing to the uncertainty which exists as to the law which runs in that Protectorate; and whether he can now give the House any information as to whether the Workmen's Compensation Act is in force in the said Protectorate.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) My hon. friend's Question refers to a matter which is still under the consideration of the Department, and I think it will be of advantage if I defer my reply for the present.

Ross-shire Schools Water Supply.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state the number of public schools on the mainland of Ross-shire to which a water supply is not laid on, and the names of such schools.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The number of schools in this position is forty-seven, and the names are as follows—

Easter Ross District.—Ardross, Crocik, Lubcroy, Hill of Fearn, Kilmuir Easter, Newmore, Tullich.

Black Isle District.—Arpafeelie, Cullicudden, Drumsrnittal, Killen, Newhall, Peddieston, Sore.

Mid Ross District.—Achduart Achiltibuie, Achnasheen Altandhu, Badralloch, Boath Bordbuie, Ferintosh, Islemartin, Kinlochluichart, Mulbuie Scatwell, Strathcannaird, Strathconan, Tanera (Ardindrean).

Western District.—Arinacrinachd, Cuaig, Dibaig, Inverasdale, Isle Horisdale, Kallakillie, Laide, Mellon Udrigle, Melvaig, Opinin, Pollewe, Sand.

South Western District.—Ardineaskan, Auchmore, Dornie, Inverinate, Killilan, Shiel.

It must not be inferred that the authorities concerned acquiesce in the view that it is necessary to have a supply of water "laid on," even if it were possible, to every single school.

Pauper Lunacy in the Island of Lewis.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary for Scotland, having regard to the fact that the recently issued Report of the Commissioners in Lunacy for Scotland, shows at Chapter XVI. that the local authorities in the Island of Lewis have made representations in regard to the heavy burden imposed upon the rates by pauper lunacy, will he state how he proposes to meet these representations, especially bearing in mind that the proposal to accommodate harmless lunatics in the poorhouses at Stornoway did not commend itself to the chairman and the two medical Commissioners when they visited the poorhouse.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) Accommodation of harmless lunatics in the poorhouse at Stornoway has not been rejected in principle by the Board of Lunacy. The proposal suggested by the Committee of the Lewis combination would not have provided for a sufficient number of patients to justify the institution of lunatic wards. If the proposal is amended so as to increase the accommodation the matter is still open to consideration.

Island of Lewis Water Supply.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary for Scotland, in view of the fact that no provision is made in the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill for the supply of water in insanitary districts in the congested area of the Highlands and Islands of Scotland, such as the Island of Lewis, and that the local authority have no adequate funds with which to undertake the work, will he state whether he has yet applied to the

Treasury for the requisite assistance; and, if not, will he explain the cause of the delay, especially bearing in mind that nearly every outbreak of fever in the island has been attributed to the defective water supply.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I cannot do more than refer my hon. friend to the reply given to him on the 8th instant.†

Stornoway Mails.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Postmaster-General, having regard to the fact that during the last ten years letters delivered at Stornoway have increased from 458,328 to 863,824, letters posted from 353,704 to 679,224, parcels delivered from 19,708 to 48,204, parcels posted from 11,130 to 24,128, and seeing that these figures show that the postal work at Stornaway has doubled in the short space of ten years, will he state whether he can now see his way to place a faster and better steamer on the service, especially bearing in mind that in former years this concession has been withheld on the plea that the correspondence, etc., dealt with at Stornoway did not warrant the increased expenditure.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The increase in the Stornoway mails to which the hon. Member refers has been accompanied by a substantial increase in the cost of the postal service in the Stornoway district, but I am looking further into the question.

Bellaghy Mail Car Service.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he can state the name of the person whose tender has been accepted for the Bellaghy and Castledawson mail-car service; whether it was the lowest tender sent in; and, if not, on what grounds any lower tenders were not accepted.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The tender of Mr. W. B. Kennedy, the previous contractor, has been accepted for the Bellaghy and Castledawson mail-car service. This tender was not the lowest, but the difference was so trifling that I considered it inadvisable to make any change, as the present contractor had given complete satisfaction.

Shanghai Mail Service.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): To ask the Postmaster-General whether letters from Shanghai to this country, or *vice versa*, are ever sent *via* the Trans-Siberian Railway; if so, what is the time occupied upon the journey as compared with the time taken by other routes; and what is the cost of conveyance per pound of mail matter as compared with other routes.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) Letters are sent from the British Postal Agency at Shanghai to this country, and *vice versa*, by the Trans-Siberian Railway when marked by the senders for transmission by that route. The approximate time of transit from London to Shanghai by the different routes available for the conveyance of mails is as follows—

Via Siberia - -	20 days.
Via Vancouver -	27 or 28 days according to the season.
Via Suez - -	30–35 days.
Via the United States of America. -	42–45 days.

The cost per pound of the conveyance of letters sent from this country to Shanghai *via* Siberia is estimated at 6s. 8d. For letters sent *via* Suez by French Packet the cost is estimated at 4s. 3d., and in the case of German Packets at 4s. 10d. per pound. I am not in a position to give similar information in regard to letters sent *via* Vancouver or by British Packet *via* Suez, as both the Packet Companies concerned receive a round subsidy covering the whole of the services performed by them.

Post Office Contracts and the Wage Clause.

MR. W. T. WILSON (Lancashire, Westhoughton): To ask the Postmaster-General whether firms that pay from 1s. to 7s. per week less than the standard rate of wage to their employees are invited to tender for work in connection with his Department; whether the tenders of such firms are accepted, providing they agree to pay the standard rate to the workmen directly employed on such contracts; and whether firms that conduct their business on these lines are complying with the fair wages clause inserted in Government contracts.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxvii., 1165.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The fair wages clause relates expressly to work performed under the contract, and to that alone, and does not enable me to control the wages paid by a contractor for other work. At the same time, if it came to my knowledge that a firm was habitually paying low wages in connection with its private work compared with the rate which it was paying under Post Office contract, I should take that fact into consideration when assigning further contracts.

Post Office Telegraph Messengers.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT: To ask the Postmaster-General whether instructions have been given to local postmasters to canvass civilians for the employment of telegraph messengers of the age of sixteen; and whether, instead of discharging these boys to swell the ranks of the unemployed, he will retain till the age of eighteen those willing to serve in the Regular Army, and will guarantee them employment in the Post Office after they have completed their services with the colours and been discharged with a good character.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I have recently initiated measures for organising and extending the efforts frequently made by local postmasters to obtain good employment for telegraph messengers for whom there are no permanent outlets in the Post Office; and I am happy to say with much success. I do not think that ex-telegraph messengers of good character swell the ranks of the unemployed. The boys are, no doubt, well aware of the arrangement under which soldiers, discharged with good character, have for many years past been given a proportion of postmen's places.

Telegram Word Counting.

MR. W. T. WILSON: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the new system of counting multiple address and multiple page telegrams results in a financial loss to sub-postmasters; and whether he intends taking steps to compensate them for this reduction of income.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The new system—of counting, taken as a whole—will not result in a financial loss to sub-postmasters as a class, on the whole it will tend to increase their emoluments. In a few individual cases the new system might bear hardly, and I am in communication with the Treasury with the view of obviating any hardship in these few cases.

Glycerinated Calf Lymph.

MR. WEIR: To ask the President of the Local Government Board, having regard to the fact that during the last financial year the Board paid to a contractor a sum of £860 17s. 6d. in respect of hire of 505 calves, used for the production of glycerinated calf lymph, will he state for what period these calves were on an average kept at the national vaccine establishment; and will he explain why, in the Estimates for the current year, a sum of £1,350 is set down for the supply of calves and a further sum of £740 for the keep of calves, whilst there is no indication of money being paid for the hire or use of calves for the production of glycerinated calf lymph.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The sum of £1,350 represents the estimated amount for the hire of calves for the production of glycerinated calf lymph, and the sum of £740 the estimated cost of their keep whilst at the national vaccine establishment. They have usually remained there about a fortnight. I will consider whether any alteration should be made in the form of the Estimate relating to this matter.

Colwyn Bay Water Supply.

MR. WEIR: To ask the President of the Local Government Board, seeing that the Colwyn Bay Council now realise that the water supply is insufficient, will he ascertain whether any steps are being taken to augment the supply, especially in view of the increased demand for water during the holiday season.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The district is supplied with water by the Conway and Colwyn Bay Joint Water

Supply Board. The district council, who are one of the constituent authorities of the Joint Board, have for some time been pressing them to lay an additional main from the intake in Lake Cowlyd, so as to supply more water into the constituent districts, and about a week ago the Joint Board resolved to seek powers next session to take more water from the lake.

Workhouse Chaplains.

MR. MONTGOMERY (Somersetshire, Bridgwater): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that to some workhouses boards of guardians have appointed paid Anglican chaplains, to others paid Nonconformist chaplains, and to others unpaid Nonconformist chaplains; and whether workhouse chaplains must be paid, and from what denominations paid or, if allowed, unpaid chaplains must be selected.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) A person holding the office of chaplain to a workhouse must be a clergyman of the Church of England, and he usually receives a salary, but in some instances this is not the case. It is also competent for the guardians, if the circumstances render it expedient, to appoint and pay a religious instructor of any denomination for the purpose of giving religious assistance and instruction to the inmates. No inmate, however, can be required to attend any service which may be celebrated in a mode contrary to his religious principles.

Ardglass Harbour, County Down.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) whether his attention has been called to the repeated complaints that the Churn Rock in Ardglass Harbour, county Down, has caused numerous boat wrecks and loss of life, and that it is an obstruction to navigation, fatal to the development of the harbour, and detrimental to the fishing industry; and whether, having regard to the small cost at which the rock could be removed, steps to that end will be taken without further delay.

(*Answered by Mr. T. W. Russell.*) No application has been made to the Department on the subject of the removal of the Churn Rock, which is in Ardglass Harbour. The matter was considered by the Piers and Harbours Commissioners in the year 1884. These Commissioners did not feel justified in allocating to the improvement of this royal harbour any portion of the sea fisheries funds provided by 26 and 27 Vict, c. 26. The interference with the herring fishing from Ardglass is not such as would induce the Department to expend their funds, which are limited in amount, in removing the Churn Rock. It has been estimated that the removal of the rock in question would cost about £2,000.

The Official Debates.

MR. SEAVERNS (Lambeth, Brixton): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury when the evidence given before the Parliamentary Debates Select Committee will be printed and circulated among Members; whether the Government have decided what action they intend to take in regard to the Report of that Committee; and whether it is the intention of the Government to make new arrangements as to the reporting staff before the end of the present session.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The matter is receiving very careful consideration, but I am not able to make any statement at present.

Ordnance Survey.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, in view of the fact that the Departmental Committee appointed to inquire into the position of the civil servants on the Ordnance Survey in 1892 stated, on page 10 of their Report, that there was no apparent necessity for making this Paper a confidential circular, will the President of the Board reconsider his decision, and, if he cannot grant a copy of the regulations as a whole, will he give particulars of the rates of pay governing these civil servants, so that they may know the conditions of their service, and in that respect be placed on a similar footing to the civil servants in other public departments.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) My noble friend has looked into this question again, but he does not see his way to alter his decision in the matter.

Weights and Measures Act Administration.

DR. HAZEL (West Bromwich): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is now able to say when the general regulations for the guidance of local authorities in the administration of the Weights and Measures Acts will be issued, and whether, if he is unable to name the exact date of their issue, he can give an assurance that the regulations will be laid before Parliament, in accordance with Section 5, Subsection 3, of the Weights and Measures Act, 1904, before the end of the present session.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I have every hope that these regulations will be laid before Parliament before the end of the session.

Liverpool Customs Warehouses.

MR. CLELAND (Glasgow, Bridgeton): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer in how many cases the officers who were recently sent from London to examine the stock in the Liverpool warehouses were instructed to pay a second visit to the same premises; how many casks were examined; how many showed ordinary losses, how many special losses, and how many chargeable losses on each occasion; and how many of the chargeable losses found by the visiting officers were paid by the firm in question and how many have been remitted.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) In only one instance was a second visit paid to any Liverpool bonded warehouse by the officers recently detailed in the ordinary course for examination of stock. The object of such an examination is for revenue purposes only, and it is not in the public interest to divulge the information thus obtained. It may, however, be stated that the Board of Customs are satisfied with the integrity of the stock and that no irregularity had taken place in the warehouse in question.

Joint Stock Banks.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state the amount of credit balance and the amount on deposit in the joint stock banks for the last financial year in Great Britain, and in Belgium, Denmark, Switzerland, Austria-Hungary, and Sweden; and will he state the amounts on deposit in the Post Office Savings Bank and the Trustee Savings Banks for the above countries, where figures are available, for the last financial year.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) I have no official statistics as to the amount of deposits in joint stock banks either in this country or abroad. As regards savings banks in the United Kingdom, on the 31st December, 1906 (the close of the Post Office Savings Bank year) the amount due to depositors in the Post Office Savings Banks was £155,966,446; and on 20th November, 1906 (the close of the Trustee Savings Bank year), the amount due to depositors in the Trustee Savings Banks was £53,009,299. I have not the information which would enable me to answer the hon. Member's Question relative to foreign savings banks in a complete manner; but I would refer him to pages 170 to 205 of the Board of Trade Blue Book, British and Foreign Trade and Industry [Cd. 2337], where the subject is very fully treated.

Probate Fees.

SIR EDWIN CORNWALL (Bethnal Green, N.E.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that the existing order as to probate fees, is over thirty years old, and that, while *ad valorem* court fees are chargeable under it (in respect of personal estate), no such fees are levied on real estate comprised in a probate of letters of administration; if he will take steps to provide for the issue of a new order by which *ad valorem* court fees may be levied rateably on both real and personal estate; and if he will have such new order framed in such a way that the *ad valorem* court fees may increase instead of decrease proportionately with the value of the real and personal estate.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) I am aware that the existing table of fees is more than thirty years old, but it was reaffirmed by the Supreme Court Fees Order of 1884. Under the Act 38 and 39 Vict., c. 77, s. 26, the fees are fixed by the Lord Chancellor with the advice and consent of the Judges of the Supreme Court, or any three of them, and with the concurrence of the Treasury. It therefore does not rest with the Treasury to take the initiative in proposing any alteration, but, as at present advised, I see no sufficient reason for proposing an increase in the total amount of the fees.

Land Commission Clerkships.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, as the line of demarcation between second and third-class clerkships in the Land Commission has been removed, and as the nominal promotion from third class does not confer any extra benefits or privileges on clerks so promoted, whether he can state what is gained by preserving the distinction in name between the two classes; and whether, seeing that these classes are amalgamated, both will be described as second-class clerks.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The manner in which the line of demarcation between second and third-class clerks has been modified in the interests of the latter class is fully stated in my Answer to the hon. Member's Question on 1st May last.† The Land Commission do not consider it desirable to adopt the suggestion contained in the latter part of the present Question.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that there are third-class clerks in the Land Commission at present in receipt of a larger salary than the initial salary of a second-class clerk in that office, while rising to the same maximum salary by the same annual increment, and that owing to the slow rate of promotion in this Department no third-class clerk can hope to be promoted before he has reached by annual increment a salary, at least, as large as the initial salary of a second-class clerk, whether he can state the advantages, if any, gained by promotion from a third-class to a second-class clerkship in that office.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) There are a few third-class clerks in the offices of the Land Commission who receive special allowances for acting as private secretaries to the Commissioners, or for other special duty, and whose total remuneration is, therefore, in some instances higher than the initial salaries of second-class clerks. Otherwise the statement in the first part of the Question is misleading as to the relative positions as regards salary and increment which are occupied by third and second-class clerks. The suggestion that no third-class clerk can hope to be promoted before he has reached by annual increment a salary at least as large as the initial salary of a second-class clerk is based on an incorrect assumption as to the facts.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will explain why Messrs. Jenkins, Monsell, and Eckersley have been promoted to their respective new positions in the Local Government Board over officials having longer services and possessing equal merit; and who is responsible for those appointments.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Mr. Monsell's promotion took place six years ago. Messrs. Jenkins and Eckersley have recently been promoted in their own Department, but not over officials of longer service possessing equal qualifications for the posts. The promotions were made by the permanent head of the Local Government Board in accordance with the Treasury regulations.

Irish Mineral Rights.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in the case of estates purchased under the Land Act of 1903, the mineral rights are vested in the Land Commission; whether the Land Commission have power to deal with the mineral rights; and whether he proposes to arrange that a geological survey of Ireland should be made with a view that the county councils may take advantage of and utilise any discoveries of mineral wealth within their districts.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxiii., 851–2.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) In reply to the first part of the Question I would refer to Sections 13 and 99 of the Irish Land Act, 1903. A Bill for the purpose of enabling the Land Commission to dispose of mineral rights vested in them has been introduced by the Government, and is at present before Parliament. The Government do not propose to undertake any geological survey of Ireland other than that which is at present being carried out under the Department of Agriculture.

Irish Local Government Clerks.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of first-class clerks, higher-grade clerks, abstractors, and other clerks employed in the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland, the Board of Works, the Local Government Board, Valuation Office, and Registry of Deeds, respectively, and the proportion of higher appointments and staff officerships in each of these Departments as compared with the whole clerical staff employed.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I must refer the hon. Member to the Estimates for the current year, which give the particulars asked for.

Land Commission Clerical Staff.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the proportion of higher appointments and staff officerships in the Land Commission as compared with the whole clerical staff employed in these offices; whether he can state the character of the distribution of higher appointments and staff officerships in this Department, bearing in mind these averages and the technical and legal nature of the duties assigned to the clerks employed in the Land Commission offices.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I would refer the hon. Member to my Answers to his Questions on this subject on 19th March and 1st May last, to which I have nothing to add.†

Irish School Buildings—Teachers' Rooms.

MR. BARRIE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he recognises that a teachers' retiring room is a necessary adjunct to a good school building; and will he instruct the Board of Works in future to permit the cost of the inclusion of such rooms in the estimates on which the State grant is based.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The new plans for schoolhouses do not provide for private rooms for the teachers. The provision of such rooms would greatly increase the cost.

Pollock Estate, County Galway.

MR. HAZLETON (Galway, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state what progress has been made in connection with the purchase of the Pollock estate, near Creggs, county Galway, and what amount of land there will be available for distribution in the event of the purchase being completed.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have considered their inspectors' report on this estate, but will not be in a position to make a formal offer for purchase until the vendor's title is clear. Further inquiries in the matter are being made. It is anticipated that, if the purchase should be effected, over 2,000 acres of untenanted land will be available for distribution.

Mallaranny Railway.

DR. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is yet in a position to state the result of the interview between the engineer to the Irish Board of Works and the engineer to the Midland Great Western Railway of Ireland, as to the cost of construction of the proposed railway from Mallaranny, county Mayo, to Belmullet.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The negotiations in this matter have not yet terminated. The Government are using all possible efforts to bring this matter to a satisfactory conclusion, and in the meantime it would not be desirable to state the progress of the negotiations piecemeal.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxi., 639; clxxiii., 851–2.

Synan Estate, County Limerick.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say what progress has been made by the Estates Commissioners with regard to the purchase of the untenanted land on the Synan estate, situate at Carnane, near Fedamore, in the county of Limerick; whether the purchase price has been agreed on; and, if so, will the lands be soon divided.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners made a provisional offer last month for the purchase of the untenanted land on the Carnane portion of this estate, but the owner has postponed his decision upon the offer until the Commissioners shall have inspected the remainder of the estate in other parts of the county, and have made a proposal for the purchase of the entire estate.

All-red Mail Route.

Mr. LONSDALE: To ask the Prime Minister whether any conclusion has been arrived at with respect to the proposed all-red route for mail communication, travel, and transportation, which was declared by unanimous resolution of the Imperial Conference to be demanded in the interests of the Empire; and whether His Majesty's Government are prepared to recommend Parliament to accord financial support to this scheme.

(*Answered by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*) The matter is still under consideration, and I am not in a position to make any announcement.

Higher Division Clerks.

Mr. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will grant a statement showing the present age, length of service, and annual emoluments of each officer in the Departments under his control who, during the past ten years, entered by the Higher Division, Class I., examination; the number of abstractors (assistant clerks), with from one to ten years' service, who are in receipt of less than £100 per annum; and the number of men who have entered by nomination during each of the last ten years.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The hon. Member has put down Questions of a similar character respecting a number of other public Departments. My right hon. friends concerned and myself are agreed that we should not be justified in authorising the collection of these statistics, which in our opinion would involve an expenditure of time and labour out of all proportion to any result obtainable.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

H.M.S. "King Edward VII."—The Defective Rudder.

Mr. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will state the names of the persons who were responsible in the Ayrshire Foundry Company for fraudulently supplying a defective rudder to H.M.S. "King Edward VII."

*The CIVIL LORD of the ADMIRALTY (Mr. Lambert, Devonshire, South Molton): I am informed that the Memorial submitted to the Scottish Law Officers in 1904 contained no imputation whatever against any director of this company except Mr. Marshall, the managing director, and that in his case the accusation was made by one person and denied by three. No criminal prosecution appears to have been considered expedient in 1904, and in the opinion of the Lord Advocate it would be out of the question now.

Mr. LEA: Then is nobody to be punished in this matter?

*Mr. LAMBERT: I have said no criminal prosecution appears to have been considered expedient.

H.M.S. "Blake" and H.M.S. "Blenheim."

*Captain FABER (Hampshire, Andover): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will state what is the present armament of H.M.S. "Blake" and H.M.S. "Blenheim," which are to be converted into mother ships for destroyers.

I beg also to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will state what are the modifications to be made in the armaments of the cruisers H.M.S. "Blake" and H.M.S "Blenheim."

*MR. LAMBERT: The original armament of the "Blake" and "Blenheim" was two 9·2 inches, ten 6-inches, and sixteen 3-pounders. The modified armament as mother ships for destroyers will be four 6-inches, four 12-pounders, six 6-pounders. The conversion is now in progress.

Destroyers at Malta.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty when it is proposed to replace the two destroyers belonging to the flotilla at Malta which have been lost recently.

*MR. LAMBERT: Only one destroyer has been lost and this will not be replaced.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Wolverhampton, E.): Why is not the lost one to be replaced?

*MR. LAMBERT: Because in the opinion of the Admiralty it is not onsidered necessary.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Was it the intention of the Admiralty to bring it home from the Mediterranean before it was lost?

*MR. LAMBERT: I cannot say.

The Home Fleet.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if the Home Fleet, in addition to taking part in the review in August, will execute any evolutions under steam as a fighting Fleet this summer.

*MR. LAMBERT: The reply is in the affirmative.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis) asked whether the Home Fleet was to be exercised at night.

*MR. LAMBERT said the Home Fleet would be exercised at the discretion of the Commander-in-Chief.

MR. BELLAIRS said that was not his point. The important part of his Question was whether the Fleet would be exercised at night.

*MR. LAMBERT: I am not competent to state what will be considered necessary. It is within the discretion of the Commander-in-Chief. He will do whatever is necessary for the efficiency of the Fleet, I am sure.

Safety of the Fleet.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if, in a time of profound peace, when our battleships and cruisers are anchored in the waters near Portsmouth and elsewhere, any precautions are taken which would make it impossible for a treacherous foe to surprise our vessels and destroy them with torpedoes; and, if not, will he consider what means should be taken to provide against such a contingency?

MR. LAMBERT: I think my hon. friend's Question can hardly be intended seriously, but I may say by way of reply, that an attack on the Fleet by a friendly nation at a period of profound peace, without any warning, is not, in the opinion of the Board of Admiralty, a possible contingency.

MR. LUPTON: I will raise this Question at the proper time.

Naval White Paper.

*MR. BELLAIRS: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty why the White Paper on the Naval Strength of the Powers was published in the Press on 18th July, while it had not then been received at the Vote Office?

MR. LAMBERT: This Return was ordered to be printed by the House of Lords, and the subsequent arrangements were undertaken by its officers.

MR. BELLAIRS: Is it not the habit to supply Lords' Papers to Members of this House, and is it not the fact that though this Paper was issued on Thursday morning it was not in the Vote Office of the House of Commons till Friday afternoon ?

[No Answer was returned.]

Wales and Army Contracts.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any of the contracts connected with the clothing of the Regular Army and the Militia have in the last year been placed in Wales; and, if so, where, and to what extent ?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE): During the financial year ended 31st March, 1907, no contracts for clothing and clothing materials were placed in Wales.

*MR. REES: Will Wales get some of the contracts in future ?

MR. HALDANE: We are always glad to give them to Wales if we can.

Irvine Moor Manœuvres.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can give the age of the two privates, Doyle and Sproute, of the 4th Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders, who are stated to have died from the heat on the 16th instant after the sham fight at Irvine Moor, and the average age of the other thirty-five men who had to go to the hospital on the same occasion.

MR. HALDANE: Private Doyle was forty-seven years of age and Private Sproute forty-four. Only eleven other cases due to heat were treated and all had returned to duty by the 18th; the average age of these men was twenty-three years.

Volunteers and the Territorial Army.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Croydon): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state which are the Volunteer units which will be destroyed in order to give effect to the reduction of the force from 219 battalions, as at present, to the 168 battalions of the Territorial Army.

MR. HALDANE: The reply is in the negative. Until the Associations are formed it would be quite impracticable to attempt to devise in detail any such reconstruction of the existing Volunteer battalions. The reductions in point of units will probably not be as great as the right hon. Gentleman seems to imagine.

Territorial Army—Strength for Active Service.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether an Estimate of the total numbers of the Territorial Army likely to be actually available for active service in the field was made before the Bill proposing to establish the force was submitted to Parliament; and, if so, what was the number of men then estimated as likely to be available; and has the Estimate been varied by the withdrawal of the Militia from the Territorial Army.

MR. HALDANE: The Answer to the first part of this Question is in the affirmative. The mobile troops, as apart from purely coast defence troops, according to the estimate presented to Parliament [Cd. 3296] will consist of fourteen mounted brigades, fourteen divisions with certain Army troops and line of communication troops, or about 291,000 officers and men in all. The numbers required for the Special Contingent were not included in this Estimate, and the fact that the Militia is now to form part of the Special Contingent does not in any way affect the numbers of the Territorial Army.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Are the figures given in the Return actual or merely nominal figures ? Do they take into account the necessary withdrawals from the field force ?

MR. HALDANE: What withdrawals ?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Men ill, or men who for other reasons are unable to respond when called out.

MR. HALDANE: The right hon. Gentleman asked for an estimate, and I have given one.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I want to know what will be the available field force in time of war for the Territorial Field Army.

MR. HALDANE: That is not the Question on the Paper. I have given him the estimate asked for in the Question.

The Artillery.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in spite of the definite and categorical pledge given on behalf of the Army Council by the Under-Secretary of State that there would be no reduction in the artillery till trained Militiamen, liable to serve abroad, can take their place, the establishment and the strength of both the Royal Garrison Artillery and of the Royal Horse and Field Artillery have already been reduced; whether, in view of the great importance of maintaining an adequate trained artillery force, he can now give an assurance that he does not propose to adhere to his announced intention of reducing the Regular Horse and Field Artillery by sixty-seven officers and 3,700 other ranks; and whether, if he is unable to give this information, he will state on what grounds of public policy he considers it necessary to refuse it to the House of Commons.

MR. HALDANE: In the various replies I have given to the right hon. Gentleman I have made it perfectly clear that the pledge with regard to Horse and Field Artillery to which he refers, and which was concerned with the general scheme of reorganisation, has been strictly adhered to. Not a single field battery has been done away with by me. The last reduction of the sort was made by the right hon. Gentleman himself, who, in 1905, brought home a field battery from Egypt and abolished it. The only diminution in Horse and Field Artillery which has taken place in my time is the consolidation for administrative reasons of certain artillery depôts, and the placing on the lower establishment of six batteries which came home from South Africa last year. I have not in any way broken my pledge, as suggested by the right hon. Gentleman, nor have I failed to give the House the fullest information available. May I, in view of what I have now said many times over, express the hope that the right hon. Gentleman and the hon. Member for Stepney, who was associated with him in the discharge of his duties as my predecessor in office, will now rest content. For I have nothing to add to the information given in this Answer and in my Answer to the similar Question put to me on behalf of the right hon. Gentleman on the 1st inst.†—nor do I propose to give to him any further undertaking of any sort or kind.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER asked the right hon. Gentleman to answer the first Question, whether it was a fact that, in spite of a pledge given, the Royal Horse and Field Artillery and the Royal Garrison Artillery had been reduced by nearly 5,000 men. The second Question he had asked several times. Did the right hon. Gentleman adhere to the announcement made in the House that the Horse and Field Artillery were to be reduced by 3,700 men and sixty-seven officers; did the right hon. Gentleman still propose that?

MR. HALDANE: The Answer to the first Question is, No. As to the second Question, I do not propose to add a single word to the Answer I have given.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER appealing to the Speaker, said: I am putting a perfectly reasonable Question on a matter of public policy upon which I submit I might expect an Answer; I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the statement made in the House last year to the effect that he proposed to reduce the Horse and Field Artillery by 3,700 men and 67 officers still forms part of the right hon. Gentleman's policy. The Answer to that Question has not been given before, and has not been given to-day.

MR. HALDANE: An Answer to that appears on the Estimates. I have given the Answer over and over again, and decline to give it again.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I am in the recollection of the House, and I submit that no Answer has ever been given.

*MR. SPEAKER: This is in the nature of a debate.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): Will the right hon. Gentleman say if the strength of the Garrison

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxvii., 346.

Artillery has been reduced since he took office?

Mr. HALDANE: The Question refers to Horse and Field Artillery, not Garrison Artillery. ["Yes."] Will the hon. Gentleman point out where Garrison Artillery is mentioned? ["Line 5."]

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN reminded the right hon. Gentleman that the Question was "whether the establishment and strength of both the Royal Garrison Artillery and the Royal Horse and Field Artillery have already been reduced."

Mr. HALDANE: That appears on the Estimates; of course they have been reduced in pursuance of the policy recommended by the Committee appointed by the right hon. Gentleman, which I have carried out.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER again asked was it a fact or not that, in spite of the pledge given, the Garrison, Horse and Field Artillery had been greatly reduced since the right hon. Gentleman had been in office.

Mr. HALDANE: This has nothing to do with the Garrison Artillery, as the right hon. Gentleman must know; as to the other Question, I have already answered.

Mr. LEVERTON HARRIS (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) asked whether the right hon. Gentleman did not in July last make the statement that the Horse and Field Artillery would be reduced by 3,700 men and sixty-seven officers.

Mr. HALDANE: The hon. Member can inform himself upon that point.

The Primrose League and Army Bands.

Mr. BRANCH (Middlesex, Enfield): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he is able to give the House any information as to the means by which the services of the band of the Royal Artillery were obtained for a meeting of the Primrose League at Southgate on the 22nd June.

Mr. HALDANE: The applicant appears on inquiry to have been under the impression that an entertainment to Members of the Primrose League given at his own expense and in his own grounds would not be a political meeting. Moreover, he has informed the Army Council that the statutes of the Primrose League declare that this League is independent of Party politics. The view of the Army Council is that both of these impressions were erroneous, and the applicant has been informed that the statement which he originally made that the meeting for which he asked for the services of the band would not be a political one was in military opinion ill-founded.

Rabies in Rhodesia.

Mr. RIDSDALE (Brighton): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if a consignment of dog muzzles has been recently ordered by the Rhodesian Administration for the purpose of stamping out rabies among native dogs.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.): It appears from the report of the Medical Director for 1906 that rabies, which first appeared in Southern Rhodesia in 1902, became more prevalent and more generally distributed in 1906 than in any previous year. Regulations were accordingly enacted with regard to the muzzling of dogs and other measures calculated to check the disease, and 20,000 muzzles have been ordered for distribution to natives. The Chief Native Commissioner of Matabeleland reports that the Matabele are much alarmed at the spread of the disease, and are killing off their own dogs in large numbers.

Mr. RIDSDALE: Was the consent of the native chiefs obtained before the order was given?

Mr. CHURCHILL: I do not know, but I do not suppose it would be possible to enforce the order without their co-operation.

Cape Colony and Transvaal and Orange River Self-Government.

Mr. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Legislative Assembly of the Cape Colony has passed a resolution thanking His Majesty's Government for the grant of self-government recently made to the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies; and, if so, will he say what were the terms of the resolution and by what majority was it passed.

MR. CHURCHILL: On the 2nd July the Cape House of Assembly unanimously passed the following resolution: "This House records its satisfaction with the policy pursued by His Majesty's Government in granting free Parliamentary institutions to the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies, and expresses its confidence that the result of that policy will be to assure peace and prosperity, and to promote the ultimate union of His Majesty's dominions in South Africa."

Unrest in East Africa.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the fact that practically all native risings and unrest have been caused by the apprehension that they will be deprived, one way or another, of their lands, he will make it clear that the native reserves in East Africa are inalienable.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg at the same time to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, when creating native reserves in British East Africa, he will consider the possibility of placing them in the hands of trustees with a view to prevent them being alienated at any time.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Secretary of State concurs fully in the principle that a native reserve, when once established, shall be inalienable except with the consent of the natives themselves, and upon its being proved to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State that alteration is required. When I informed the hon. Member in reply to his Question of the 17th of this month that there was no present intention of rescinding the Kikoyo reservation I did not mean to suggest that there would be any arbitrary or unjust confiscation in the future, but it is possible that, circumstances may arise, such as the increase or decrease of a tribe, the failure of certain staple articles of food within a reserve, a deterioration in its sanitary condition, etc., which would render an alteration of its boundaries or location both just and desirable. I need scarcely say, however, that any proposed change of this kind would be most closely scrutinised by the Government, which in this matter, as in all others affecting the welfare of the natives, would act as their trustees.

MR. ASHLEY: My Question was whether the Government would consider the desirability of placing the reserves in the hands of trustees?

MR. CHURCHILL: I have said the Government will act as trustees.

MR. ASHLEY: I suggested private individuals should act. I have not so much confidence in the Government.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER asked if the Answer would apply equally to Basutoland?

MR. CHURCHILL: No doubt it will apply generally.

Mr. Churchill to visit East Africa.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the rising importance of the East Africa and Uganda Protectorates and the questions which must continually come before the Colonial Office, he could take an early opportunity of visiting the country and making himself personally acquainted with some of the problems.

MR. CHURCHILL: Lord Elgin has asked me whether I could arrange to visit the Protectorates in question during the autumn recess, and I am of course very glad to place myself at his disposal.

Rand Strike.

MR. MACKARNESS: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the demand made upon the services of Imperial troops by the continuance of the strike on the Rand, and the danger both of diminishing the white population and reviving racial animosities, His Majesty's Government will consider the advisability of using their friendly offices with the Transvaal Government for the purpose of bringing about a termination of the strike by arbitration, or such other method as may commend itself to that Government.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The Secretary of State fully sympathises with the desire of the hon. and learned Member to put an end to this unhappy commercial conflict, with its grave and destructive influences. But all the information at our disposal goes to show that the Government of the Transvaal is quite alive to the difficulties of the situation, and is in close touch with both sides in the dispute.

Mr. MACKARNESS asked as to the position of the strike now?

Mr. CHURCHILL: The information we have received from South Africa is very full, but it does not reach us, now that responsible Government is established, until it is settled in the form of minutes or despatches from the Lieutenant-Governor. We have not had any later telegraphic communication.

Mr. HAROLD COX (Preston) asked how long it was intended the troops should remain there doing police duty.

Mr. CHURCHILL: That raises a considerable matter of policy which I cannot answer.

Mr. MACKARNESS: Have the Imperial Government named any date beyond which the Imperial troops will not be required.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Not at present.

Zomba Garrison.

Mr. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the armed forces at Zomba are being reduced.

Mr. CHURCHILL: There has been some reduction in the number of troops at Zomba since March last, as the force of King's African Rifles in the British Central Africa Protectorate generally has been reduced by two companies.

Mr. REES: Are further reductions contemplated?

Mr. CHURCHILL: I do not know.

St. Helena Natives and the Transvaal Mines.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any, and, if so, what, statutory conditions governing the importation of labour into the Transvaal prevent British subjects from St. Helena from working in the Transvaal mines.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I am advised that natives of St. Helena could not be introduced into the Transvaal at the present time except in accordance with the provisions of the Labour Importation Ordinance, 1904.

British Interests in Asia Minor.

Sir EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will see that British interests in Asia Minor are safeguarded with special reference to the avoidance of any monopoly in railway construction, with exclusive advantage to any single Power.

Mr. J. A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden; for Sir Edward Grey): My right hon. friend is not aware that any railways have been constructed with exclusive advantage to any single Power. The last concession for railway construction in Asia Minor was granted to a British company. My right hon. friend is fully alive to the importance of safeguarding British interests in Asiatic Turkey; but he is not aware that any concessions for railways likely to prove detrimental to those interests have been granted recently.

Kaid Sir Harry Maclean.

Mr. MACLEAN (Bath): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Kaid Sir Harry Maclean is still a prisoner in Morocco; and if there is any news as to his safety and well-being.

Mr. J. A. PEASE: According to the latest reports received from His Majesty's Minister at Tangier, Sir Harry Maclean is still in the hands of Raisuli, but His Majesty's Government have no reason to fear for his personal safety and well-being.

Khedivial Law School—Case of M. Lambert.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Government of France have made any representations to His Majesty's Government on the Lambert affair; whether the Government of France consider Mr. Dunlop's action as contrary to the spirit of the Treaty of 1904; and whether, in the interests of the *entente cordiale*, His Majesty's Government will recommend the Government of Egypt to reappoint M. Lambert as principal of the Khedivial Law School, or, failing him, to consult the wishes of the French Government.

MR. J. A. PEASE: No representations have been made by the French Government, and my right hon. friend has nothing to add to the Answer given to the hon. Member on the 16th instant.†

Horse-taximeter Cabs.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state how many horse-taximeter cabs are now awaiting registration, and for what reason registration up to now has been refused; and on what grounds objection is taken to horse-taximeter cabs plying for a lesser fare than that fixed by statute.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I cannot say how many owners of horse-cabs wish to fit them with taximeters. As I have already explained, my intention is to enable every cab to use a taximeter. The law officers, however, advise me that the taximeters which have up to now been submitted for use with horse-cabs do not comply with the existing statutory requirements; so that the only means of effecting my purpose is by legislation, which I hope to introduce in the course of a few days.

London Police and the Yiddish Language.

MR. STARKEY (Nottinghamshire, Newark): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many members of the Metropolitan Police Force are now proficient in Yiddish; and how many of them are now studying that language.

MR. GLADSTONE: Fifteen men are reported to be tolerably proficient, and twenty-five others to be studying.

Convict Richard Coles.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the friends of Richard Coles, who was found insane at the last Winchester assizes and is at present confined at Broadmoor, have petitioned him to confine Coles in the Hampshire County Asylum, as they are too poor to visit him at that distance from Hampshire; and whether, in view of the fact that the prisoner is perfectly quiet and suffers from depression, he will cause him to be transferred to the county asylum.

MR. GLADSTONE: Yes, I have received an application to that effect and have given it very careful consideration. I regret, however, that in view of all the circumstances of the case I do not feel justified in authorising the patient's removal from Broadmoor. The patient tried to murder his wife, and the case is more suitable for Broadmoor than for a county asylum.

MR. ASHLEY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the relations of this man are extremely poor?

MR. GLADSTONE: Yes, Sir, I have taken all the circumstances into consideration.

Weak-minded Prisoners.

MR. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether there are any statistics to show the number of prisoners placed under observation because of their mental condition; what is the policy of the Department towards the number who may be classified as irresponsibles; and whether he would be willing to grant a Return of such prisoners in all our chief prisons.

MR. GLADSTONE: Both in local and in convict prisons those prisoners who are not certifiably insane but are unfit through mental deficiency for the ordinary penal discipline form a separate class and are specially treated. In the year 1906–7 the numbers were, in local prisons 355, in convict prisons 107. The policy of the Prison Commissioners is to place these prisoners under the special charge of the medical officers of the prisons and to keep them continuously under the personal care of selected warders. The medical officers regulate their discipline and diet, and allow them such employment as is suited to the condition of each individual. In addition to those so classified there are other prisoners, the number of whom I cannot give, who are temporarily under observation to ascertain their mental state, particularly prisoners who have been remanded by the magistrates in order to obtain reports from the medical officers on their mental condition before dealing with them.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxviii., 535.

British Colonial Consuls.

MR. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his decision to appoint consuls to act in British Colonies was in any way due to requests made or advice tendered by the Colonial Premiers or other Colonial authorities; whether the gentlemen who have been, or are about to be, appointed to these appointments were selected in consultation with Colonial authorities; whether it is anticipated that the services of these gentlemen will be of value to the Colonies; and, if so, whether the Colonies have offered to pay the whole or any part of the salaries of the gentlemen so selected.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): The proceedings at the recent Imperial Conference had no doubt a great deal to do with the decision to extend the present system of commercial agents in the Colonies. Care will naturally be taken to see that any persons appointed to these posts are acceptable to the Colonies in which they will reside. As the commercial agents will be appointed primarily in the interests of traders of the United Kingdom, it is not in contemplation to suggest that any portion of their salaries should be met by the Colonial Governments.

In reply to a supplementary Question,

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE was understood to say that he thought the Prime Minister of New Zealand pressed the suggestion.

Life Insurance.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that with some industrial insurance companies in London the practice has grown up of issuing policies on lives other than those of the proposers or payers of the premiums; whether his attention has been called to the fact that these companies are issuing such policies both in England and Ireland; and whether, as the absence of assurable interest generally renders the policies illegal and the amount insured irrecoverable unless as an act of grace, he will cause a warning to be issued to the companies and to the public.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am aware that industrial insurance companies issue policies on lives other than those of the proposers and payers of the premiums, but I am not aware that the practice prevails of their issuing such policies where the insurer has no insurable interest in the life insured. I have no doubt that the companies are aware of the provisions of the law on the subject, and I doubt if it is necessary to issue a warning such as that suggested by the hon. Member. If, however, he has any definite information that he can furnish as to the issue of these illegal policies I shall be glad to consider it.

Scottish Emigration.

MR. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will state what was the number of emigrants sailing from Scottish ports during the first six months of the present year, distinguishing, as far as possible, emigrants of Scottish nationality from emigrants of other nationalities passing through Scotland.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am causing the particulars asked for by my hon. friend to be printed with the Votes.

[The following was the statement printed with the Votes]:

Statement showing the passenger movement between Scottish ports and non-European countries during the six months January to June, 1907, distinguishing passengers of Scottish nationality.

	Scottish.	Other.	Total.
Number of passengers outward - -	29,301	11,754	41,055
Number of passengers inward - -	2,784	4,062	6,846
Balance outward - -	26,517	7,692	34,209

Netherfield Railway Crossing Fatality.

MR. THORNE (West Ham, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been called to a railway crossing accident which happened at Saville's Crossing, Netherfield, Nottingham, on Tuesday morning, the 16th inst., when a school girl, aged ten, was killed; if he is aware that the Great Northern and Midland Railways run side by side at the said crossing, and that twelve other fatal accidents have happened at this crossing; and if he intends to take any action in the matter.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: This sad accident was reported to the Board of Trade by the Great Northern Railway Company. I am in communication with the company on the subject, and will inform the hon. Member of the result.

All-British Mail Route to Australia.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade what progress has been made with the negotiation for the establishment of a fast all-British mail service to Australia and New Zealand.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The matter is still under consideration, and I am not in a position to make any announcement at present.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): Can the right hon. Gentleman give any idea when the result will be made known.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I cannot say at present.

Gas Light and Coke Company.

MR. THORNE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the Public Control Committee of the London County Council have given permission to the Gas Light and Coke Company to reimpose meter rents at a cost to the consumers of London of about £60,000 per annum; and whether, in view of the pledge given by the Gas Light and Coke Company that meter rents, which had been abolished in 1905, should not be reimposed, he intends taking any action in the matter.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I understand that the London County Council have acquiesced in the proposal of the Gas Light and Coke Company to modify the understanding made with the Council in 1903 so as to permit them to reimpose meter rents (which were discontinued in 1895) at an estimated cost to consumers of about £60,000 per annum in lieu of raising the price of gas. This has been done subject to the company giving an undertaking that the authorised dividend shall in future be calculated as if the price of their gas were 1d. per 1,000 cubic feet higher than that actually charged; that the price of gas to the company's ordinary consumers north of the Thames will not be increased beyond the present price of 2s. 11d. per 1,000 cubic feet for a period of one year; and that the annual meter charge for a three-light meter shall not exceed 1s. 8d. per annum. The company appear to be acting within their statutory powers and the Board of Trade do not seem to have any authority to intervene. I understand that the Public Control Committee of the London County

Council were influenced in their recommendation by the fact that the poorer class of consumers who use automatic meters will not be affected by the change.

Royal Commission on Sewage Disposal.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department when the final or further Report of the Royal Commission on the Treatment and Disposal of Sewage, which was appointed in 1898, is expected to be ready.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): Perhaps I may answer this Question. I understand that the Royal Commission hope to issue a further Report before the end of the year. I also understand that the investigation of the disposal of trade effluents when not mixed with sewage, which will form the subject of the final Report of the Commission, has been commenced.

The Post Office and the Workmen's Compensation Act.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General what course he proposes to adopt with regard to compensation to injured postal servants in view of his decision to issue no scheme under the Compensation Act of last year.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.; for Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON): The Post Office servants to whom the Act applies will be dealt with under its terms, and, generally, I may add that where the Post Office sick pay regulations afford more favourable terms these will be continued. The full details have not, however, yet been settled by the Treasury; when they are they will be published in the Post Office Circular.

P. & O. Mail Contract.

MR. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether a new mail contract has been made with the Peninsular and Oriental Company; and, if so, when it is proposed to submit that contract for the approval of the House.

CAPTAIN NORTON (for Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON): The new contract with the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company has not yet been completed, and I cannot at present say when it will be possible to submit the instrument for the approval of the House; but I hope before the end of the present session.

MR. SMEATON (Stirlingshire): Is the question of the limit of speed still open to revision?

CAPTAIN NORTON asked for notice of the Question.

Westmoreland Telephones.

MR. STEWART-SMITH (Westmoreland, Kendal): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he is aware that the National Telephone Company, having made agreements with persons in Westmoreland to have a telephone at their private residences (including the right to send messages over trunk lines) for the sum of £5 for twelve months with 300 free calls, and subsequent calls at the rate of 6s. 8d. per 100, are now declining to permit these calls at the rate specified, and are insisting on entirely new agreements being made at the minimum charge of £5 and 300 free calls; and whether he can exercise any control or use any influence in the matter.

CAPTAIN NORTON (for Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON): I have no knowledge of the circumstances mentioned by the hon. Member. The question at issue appears to rest upon the proper interpretation of the agreements between the National Telephone Company and their subscribers, on which I am not in a position to offer an opinion.

Low Valley School.

MR. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether there is a deficiency of school accommodation at present at Low Valley, in the West Riding of Yorkshire; whether any progress has been made in providing new school accommodation; and, if not, why Church and Roman Catholic schools have been recently closed as unnecessary.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): I am informed that the local authority hope to have completed the conveyance of the site for a new school in the course of a week or two, and that permanent buildings will be provided with all despatch. I understand that there are sufficient places available in the various schools for the children who require them, but I am having Returns prepared of the attendance up to the end of this month, and in the event of any overcrowding upon the recognised accommodation being found to exist I propose to require that a temporary school shall be erected to be ready for occupation after the summer holidays.

MR. LANE-FOX: Is it not the fact that forty-one girls have been refused admission to this school, and that the decision of the managers of the school that it is overcrowded has been overruled by the local authorities?

MR. MCKENNA: On the last point I must ask for notice. I believe it is the case that forty-one children have been refused admission to the school.

MR. LANE-FOX: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is aware that the Roman Catholic elementary school at Low Valley is a modern and well-equipped building, and that the adjacent Council school is a very old and unsatisfactory building; and will he explain why the latter is maintained by the West Riding County Council, while the former is refused maintenance as being unnecessary.

MR. MCKENNA: I am unable to say whether the Roman Catholic school is a modern building, but when the Board's architect visited it last year it was far from satisfactory for school purposes. The Council school building is admittedly unsuitable, and its use will be discontinued as soon as a new school is provided. The Council school is maintained by the local education authority, because it is recognised as a public elementary school; the Roman Catholic school is not so maintained because recognition as a public elementary school has been refused.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education what steps he proposes to take in order that the Low Valley Catholic school may be again placed on the grant list.

MR. MCKENNA: No new facts have been brought to my notice which require or justify any modification of my previous decision.

MR. BOLAND: In consequence of the unsatisfactory nature of the reply I shall raise this Question on the Motion for adjournment on Friday afternoon.

The Education Regulations.

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): On behalf of the hon. Member for London University, I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether schools which were on the grant list for the year 1906–7, but which during the school year 1907–8 failed to fulfil one or more of the conditions set out in the Regulations which would entitle them to receive the increased grants under Articles 39 to 41 of the Regulations, will continue to receive grants as heretofore, not only for the school year 1907–8, as stated in Article 42, but subsequently, provided they satisfy the Regulations in other respects, or whether it is his intention after the year 1908 to strike off such schools from the grant list altogether.

MR. MCKENNA: The schools referred to will receive, in respect of the school year 1907–8, not the grants "as heretofore," but the grants specified in Article 42 of the new Regulations, provided that they satisfy the Regulations in all requisite respects. The Answer to the concluding paragraph is in the negative, but I cannot, of course, in any way bind my own action or the action of the Board of Education in future years.

MR. CARLILE: On behalf of the hon. Member for London University, I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he can state in how many schools which are recognised as secondary schools, and receive grants as such, the Board has permitted, in accordance with Article 8 of the Regulations, no languages other than English to be taught; and whether he can give the names of those schools.

MR. MCKENNA: Sanction has been given in two cases only. The first is the Central Foundation Girls' School, Stepney, which is attended mainly by girls of foreign origin, for whom instruction in English is more than usually necessary, and who have not the ordinary difficulty in mastering the initial stages of a foreign language. French, however, continues to be taught in this school for a number of hours less than the ordinary minimum required by the Board. The second case is the Duchess of Northumberland's Girls' School, Alnwick, where the curriculum is of a technical charater involving the allocation of a large amount of time to domestic subjects.

Secondary School Code for Wales.

SIR HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education when the Code and Regulations for Secondary Schools in Wales and Monmouthshire will be laid upon the Table of the House.

MR. McKENNA: The Welsh Code has already been presented to Parliament and I hope copies will be available in the course of a day or two. The Regulations for Secondary Schools in Wales and Monmouthshire will, I hope, be presented during this week.

Education Grant.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS (Sheffield, Ecclesall): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if any applications have been received from local education authorities for a share in the grant of £100,000 towards the erection of new schools; and, if so, how many applications have been received, and from what authorities.

MR. McKENNA: I have received a considerable number of inquiries as to whether a contribution from this grant will be available, but they are mostly based on a misapprehension as to the scope of the grant and no complete record of such applications has been preserved.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if he will lay upon the Table a copy of the circular to be issued to local education authorities informing them of the methods by which they should apply for their share of the £100,000 to be voted for new schools.

MR. McKENNA: The hon. Member is under a misapprehension in supposing that each local authority will be entitled to share in this grant. The grant is intended for, and restricted to, special cases where the conditions, which I have already outlined to the House, are satisfied. I am not prepared to say whether a circular will or will not be required, but I have under consideration regulations, compliance with which will be necessary in order to obtain the grant, and these will in due course be laid upon the Table.

MR. ALDEN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he will again consider the possibility of making the annual Government grant to local educational authorities payable in instalments, in view of the inconvenience caused to such authorities by the present system.

MR. McKENNA: The arrangement which my hon. friend indicates will, of course, be considered in connection with any scheme for amalgamation and simplifying the existing grants and methods of payment, and I hope I may be in a position next year to initiate considerable advance in that direction. I do not consider it possible, pending the introduction of more extensive changes, to revert to the system of quarterly instalments of annual grant, which was a purely temporary expedient.

Welsh Code.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education why the Code recently issued does not apply to Wales and Monmouthshire.

MR. McKENNA: It has been found expedient to issue a separate Code for Wales and Monmouthshire.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS: Why?

MR. McKENNA: For the same reason that it was found expedient to establish a separate Welsh Department of the Board.

The Mall.

MR. STARKEY: I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works when it is expected that the new electric light standards will be erected along the Mall.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. HARCOURT, Lancashire, N.E., Rossendale): I regret that I am unable at present to announce any date for the commencement of this work.

Public Accounts Committee's Report.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask the right hon. Member for West Derbyshire, as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, whether his attention has been called to a paragraph in *The Times* newspaper of Thursday last, the 18th July, purporting to give an account of certain passages in the Second Report of the Committee; whether he is aware that this Report had not then been presented.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH (Derbyshire, W.): My attention has been called to this matter. The Report was presented on the 16th and was sent at once to the printers and has not yet been circulated to the House. The House will, I am sure, agree that such premature publication is most objectionable. I can assure my hon. friend that as long as I have the honour to be Chairman of the Committee I shall do my best to prevent it. I think it fair to add that the Committee have always received the most hearty co-operation from the officials connected with the House in preventing any such disclosures in the past, and I am sure we may rely on that co-operation in the future.

Fishery Protection.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if information was received by H.M.S. "Hebe," lying at Balta Sound, acting for the Scottish Fishery Board, that a trawler was destroying the living of the fishermen towards Northwick, and that the reply was given that the "Hebe" had not steam up and was consequently useless; and, if so, will he say what action he proposes to take in the matter.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): H.M.S. "Hebe" has been sent to Balta Sound by the courtesy of the Admiralty mainly to preserve order among the large herring fleet, British and foreign, engaged at that place. To patrol in search of illegal trawling is thus not in her ordinary scope of duty, but in this case her Commander sent an armed boat in pursuit which, however, was not successful in making a capture. I do not think any action on my part is required.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.): The Admiralty have consistently refused to supply a gunboat for the protection of Irish fisheries. How many are supplied to Scotland?

MR. SINCLAIR: One vessel and one tender, but notice has now been given that that arrangement must terminate.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: When?

MR. SINCLAIR: That has not been decided.

Site for Dalmuir School.

MR. J. D. WHITE: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland, with reference to the land at Dalmuir acquired recently by the school board of the parish of Old Kilpatrick, in Dumbartonshire, as a site for a new school, what was the area of the land so purchased; when it was purchased; whether it was purchased under compulsory powers; what was the price paid for it; and what was taken as its annual value for rating at the time of the purchase; or, if that land formed part of a larger unit on the valuation roll, what was the area and what was taken as the annual value for rating of that unit at the time of the purchase, and by how much was that annual value reduced in consequence of the exclusion of the purchased portion.

MR. SINCLAIR: The Scottish Education Department have been in communication with the school board of Old Kilpatrick on the subject of the hon. Member's Question and have been supplied by them with the following information:—The area of ground acquired by the school board is two acres, and was purchased from Mr. William Beardmore, shipbuilder, etc., as at 15th May, 1906, although the transaction was not completed until 22nd May of this year, when the new school was completed and when Mr. Beardmore took possession of the old school ground which he purchased from the board. The ground was not purchased under compulsory powers, although the choice of a site was almost entirely confined to the ground in question. The price paid was £1,200 per acre. The area of the field, including the site of the school, was 5·778 acres. The gross rental as entered in the valuation roll of the whole field was £11 7s. 6d., and the annual value as defined by the Poor Law Acts for rating purposes was £3 10s. 10d. *quoad* the tenant and £9 3s. 9d. *quoad* the owner. The remaining portion of the field does not now appear in the valuation roll as the ground is in the market for building purposes.

House Letting in Scotland.

MR. CLELAND (Glasgow, Bridgeton): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he can state when the Report of the Departmental Committee on the missive system of house-letting in Scotland will be presented.

MR. SINCLAIR: I hope before the end of the session.

Irish Dairy Industry.

MR. HALPIN (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) whether the Department has any statistics as to the average return of milk from the dairy cows in Ireland; whether the Department is aware that cattle properly bred for milking qualities give from 50 to 100 per cent. more milk than those generally in use; and whether the Department will assist poor small farmers to buy good yearling heifers so as to rear them for milking purposes.

*THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR IRELAND (Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.): The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the negative. The Department have no such statistics, nor is it easy to see how they could be obtained, but experts place the yield at about 400 gallons. Apart from the figures, the Answer to the second part of the Question is in the affirmative. In regard to the concluding query the Department cannot undertake to purchase yearlings, and to supply them to small farmers.

Illegal Trawling in Lough Foyle.

MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) whether, when the entrance to Lough Foyle was last visited by the fishery steamer, two trawlers were caught inside the legal limit, and have since been convicted and fined; whether he is aware that illegal trawling continues on an extensive scale off the Northern Coast; and whether he can make arrangements for a more frequent and effective patrol than has hitherto been given to this district.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: The Department's cruiser "Helga" captured a steam trawler fishing within prohibited limits off the mouth of Lough Foyle on 5th June. She had visited the locality several times since, and, on the 23rd of the same month, captured another steam vessel illegally trawling. No reports of illegal trawling have since been received by the Department from the neighbourhood in question. During the month of June the "Helga" patrolled the Northern Coast on nine different days or nights.

Donegal and Kerry Fishery Harbours.

MR. P. A. McHUGH (Sligo, N.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland), whether he has observed the statement made by the Rev. Mr. Green, Inspector of Fisheries (Ireland), before the Committee on the Collooney, Ballina, and Belmullet Railways and Piers Bill, to the effect that from Killybegs, in county Donegal, to Fenit, in county Kerry, there was no harbour in which fishing boats could land at all states of the tide; and can he say what steps the Department propose taking with a view to the proper development of the fishing industry on the North-West and West Coasts of Ireland.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Mr. Green stated before the House of Commons Committee on the Collooney and Bellmulet Railway Bill that there was no harbour between Killybegs, in Donegal, and Fenit in Kerry, at which large fishing boats can, irrespective of tide, deliver their fish direct on to the railway. The Department would be very pleased to see further railway facilities provided.

Banbridge Petty Sessions.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether his attention has been called to the number of cases adjudicated upon at the special court of petty sessions held at Banbridge, county Down, on 11th June, before Mr. Howard Ferguson, J.P.; whether the law requires that such cases should be heard and determined by more than one justice of the peace; and whether having regard to the number of deaths recently amongst justices of the peace in that district, it is intended to appoint others forthwith.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. REDMOND BARRY, Tyrone, N.): I am informed that the cases referred to in the Question were prosecutions for drunkenness and indecent behaviour in the streets, which, under the Town Improvement Act, one magistrate has power to adjudicate upon. Two magistrates belonging to the Banbridge Petty Sessions district have died within the past three years, and the Lord Chancellor has recently appointed two magistrates for the district, making eleven now qualified for attendance at Banbridge Petty Sessions. The Lord Chancellor informs me that he is making further inquiries as to the necessity for appointing additional magistrates.

Canada and Irish Exports.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, with reference to the Canadian Customs Memorandum, dated 1st May, 1907, he has requested the Dominion Government to give such instructions as may enable the separation to be made of the exports of Irish produce from those of the produce of Great Britain; and, if so, whether a favourable answer has been received.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Canadian Government have been asked whether they can see their way to give the instructions suggested by the hon. Member for South Kerry, but the decision of that Government has not yet been communicated to His Majesty's Government.

Ballinskelligs Postmastership.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he can state with reference to the retirement of Mr. Patrick Haren from the position of sub-postmaster at Ballinskelligs, whether he is aware that Mr. Haren offered to comply with the wishes of the Department as regards providing premises, and that he had already built and fitted two post offices at his own expense for which the Department had not allowed him anything; and if he can say why, on the retirement of Mr. Haren, the position was not given to his assistant, who is a near relative, in accordance with the usual custom.

I beg also to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that Mr. Patrick Haren was dismissed from his position as sub-postmaster of Ballinskelligs, county Kerry, on the alleged ground that he was over the limit of age; that a false and malicious report was made to the postmaster at Killarney by Thomas O'Connor, of Ballinskelligs, against Mr. Haren; that the papers are in the possession of the secretary of the General Post Office, Dublin, and that the charge was proved to be false; whether the retirement of Mr. Haren was due to this report and not through age, as he is quite capable of performing his duties; and, if so, what steps does he propose to take so that Mr. Haren may vindicate his good character.

CAPTAIN NORTON (for Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON): As I have already informed the hon. Member, Mr. Haren's services as sub-postmaster of Ballinskelligs were not retained because he was over seventy years of age, and he was not considered to be thoroughly efficient. The imputations made against Mr. Haren by Mr. O'Connor were not regarded as proved, and Mr. Haren's retirement was not due to Mr. O'Connor's complaint. As I have already informed the hon. Member by letter, the appointment could not be given to his assistant because she was not twenty-one years of age.

Rosslare and Fishguard Mail Service.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to a resolution adopted by the Mitchelstown Rural District Council protesting against the inefficiency of the delivery of the mails in the town and district since the opening of the Rosslare and Fishguard service; and if he will consider the necessity of establishing a mail-car service between Cahir and Mitchelstown as a means of remedying the grievance complained of.

CAPTAIN NORTON (for Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON): I have just received a copy of the resolution referred to, and I have called for a Report on the subject. On its receipt an Answer shall be sent to the hon. Member.

Emoluments of British Law Officers.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury what are the average emoluments, both in salaries and fees, attached to the offices of Attorney-General and Solicitor-General for England, the Attorney-General and Solicitor-General for Ireland, and the Lord Advocate and Solicitor-General for Scotland.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): The emoluments of the English law officers are derived from fees commuted or fees paid for law cases undertaken on behalf of the Crown, and both law-officers are debarred from undertaking private practice. The average payment during the past five years amounts in the case of the Attorney-General to £13,700, and of the Solicitor-General to £10,298. The Attorney-General for Ireland receives a salary of £5,000, and the Solicitor-General for Ireland a salary of £2,000. The average of the fees from sources other than Law Charges Vote received during the past five years by the Attorney-General is £150 18s., and by the Solicitor-General £61 6s. The average of fees paid to both law officers under Sub-head E of Vote for Law Charges is £1,077 14s. 5d. But the amounts paid to the Attorney-General and Solicitor-General, respectively, cannot be ascertained without further inquiries. The Lord Advocate receives a salary of £5,000, and the Solicitor-General for Scotland a salary of £2,000. No fees are paid in either case.

Education (Scotland) Bill.

MR. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he can hold out any definite prospect of further procedure with the Education (Scotland) Bill.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I hope that further progress may be made with this Bill provided no serious or prolonged opposition is offered to it.

Pacific Islanders Protection Act.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he can now say when the Bill to amend the Pacific Islanders Protection Act will be introduced.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The matter is still under consideration, and I am not in a position to make any announcement.

Church of England Worship.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can give an assurance that no alteration shall be made in the lawful worship of the Established Church of England either by rubric, rule, or in any other way, as a result of the letters of business granted by the Crown to the Convocations of York and Canterbury unless such alteration is first submitted to Parliament.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: My hon. friend will not expect me to travel beyond the responsibility of the Government in this matter. He may rest assured that the Crown will not be advised to make any such alterations as he foreshadows without the approval of Parliament.

The Official Debates.

MR. BYLES: I beg to ask the Prime Minister what action it is proposed to take in regard to the Report of the Select Committee on Parliamentary Debates, lately issued; and will the House be afforded an opportunity of discussing the said Report.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The Committee's Report is receiving the careful consideration of the Government, but I cannot say anything as yet as to what action may be taken in the matter. I am afraid that I cannot provide an opportunity for the discussion of this Report, at any rate, during the present session.

Home Office Vote.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, seeing that on Thursday six hours and a half was devoted to the discussion on the Home

Office Vote, that out of this time the Home Secretary and Under-Secretary occupied 113 minutes, and that one Member spoke for fifty-five minutes on the Edalji case, he will, in view of the fact that only three hours and forty-three minutes were available to Members to discuss industrial questions, give another day for the discussion of this Vote?

*MR. REES: Is it not the case that while the individual Edalji occupied fifty-five minutes, not one minute was available for discussing the grievances of all the florists of London?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am not sure whether this is an accurate analysis of the way in which time was occupied by Members, but I may point out that in his opening speech, my right hon. friend the Home Secretary supplied a large quantity of information that would otherwise very naturally have formed a subject of inquiry by hon. Members, and, therefore, the necessity for some speeches, at any rate, was obviated. No more time can be afforded for the Vote.

MR. MARKHAM: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that at least a dozen Members desired to take part in the debate on this Vote in view of the multitude of industrial questions outside the London florists?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am sorry, but I cannot control the disposition of the time set apart for the discussion of Votes.

Islands of St. Thomé and Principé.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister if his attention has been called to the quantity of cocoa imported into this country from Angola and the Islands of St. Thomé and Principé; and whether, in view of the fact that the said cocoa is produced practically entirely by the slave labour of men, women, and children, and that it has been decided by His Majesty's Government that the mild form of slavery in Zanzibar shall come to an end this year, he will consider the desirability of prohibiting slave-grown produce into this country?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It is not considered desirable to take any steps in the direction indicated.

MR. BYLES: Is it not the fact that England in concert with other Powers is bound by the Ashburton Treaty, the Berlin Act of 1882, and the Russian Act of 1890, to suppress every kind of slave trade in the interior of Africa, and why are these solemn undertakings ignored?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN asked for notice.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that prison-made goods from other countries compete with goods made in this country?

[No Answer was returned.]

THE GOVERNMENT AND ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): I wish to ask whether I shall be in order or whether it will be proper for me to ask a Question relative to the procedure of the House, which has reference partly to the Committee of Supply, partly to the Appropriation Bill, but which, as it has nothing to do with any technical breach of order in Committee of Supply, I did not put to the Chairman of Committees. There is a clause in the Act of 1870 forbidding the use of public money for the building or equipping of elementary schools. Money for this very purpose is proposed to be voted in the Estimates for the current year. It is not proposed to repeal the prohibition contained in the Act of 1870. The inclusion of the Vote for this at present illegal purpose in the schedule of the Appropriation Act is assumed by the Government, I understand, to justify the illegality. But under the principles and practice which regulate our discussions on the Appropriation Bill, it is practically impossible to discuss and divide upon this policy either on the First, Second, or Third Reading of the measure; it is not only practically, but technically impossible to do so on the Committee stage; and there is no Report stage. I wish to ask whether, in these circumstances, the proposal of the Government, if carried through, would not be in effect to initiate the practice of repealing by Resolution legislation which still remains unaltered on the Statute-book; whether such a practice would not have the most far-reaching consequences; and whether it is in accordance with the principles which have hitherto governed the legislation of this House?

*MR. SPEAKER: The right hon. Gentleman has been kind enough to inform me privately that he intended to raise this question, and I have given it the best consideration I could. I have come to this conclusion, that assuming all the objections which he has stated to be well founded, yet, notwithstanding that, I do not see that any period is reached at which my jurisdiction could be invoked, or, if invoked, could be properly brought into play. It is not for me to say that the Government are not entitled to put before the House such Estimates as they consider proper. If the Committee passes those Estimates, it is not for me to say that this House shall not agree to the Report of that Vote in Supply; and the Report being agreed to it is not for me to say that it shall not be included in the Appropriation Bill. For these reasons, it seems to me that the Speaker has no authority to intervene, if he had any desire to do so. It is possible that the question may come before the Committee of Public Accounts, if the Comptroller and Auditor-General should eventually call the attention of the Committee of Public Accounts to it; and it is also possible that it might be a matter for the Courts to determine whether the Appropriation Act is sufficient to repeal by implication a section of the Act of 1870, which specifically forbids the appropriation of a certain sum of money to a particular object. In these two matters the House will see I have no right to intervene. The matter, therefore, seems to be really a constitutional one, and one entirely for the House to decide for itself. Putting the matter as shortly as possible, the two questions would seem to be these: Can the House of Commons disobey an Act of Parliament; and ought the House of Commons to disobey an Act of Parliament? With regard to the first question, I think it is obvious that the House of Commons can disobey an Act of Parliament; the second question, whether it ought, is a matter which I must leave to the conscience of the House.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL (ALLOCATION OF TIME).

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs), in moving a Resolution allocating the time to be devoted to the discussion of the Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, said he hoped the House would admit the necessity for his Motion under the circumstances in which they stood. It seemed to him that they were all agreed as to the object of the Bill. [Cries of "No."] Well, he thought it was admitted on all hands that the making of provision for evicted tenants or their representatives was an essential part of the scheme of legislation and that without such provision it was acknowledged that the agrarian question could not be settled or put in a fair way of settlement. Therefore, if the Act of 1903 was to accomplish what was expected of it, it was important that this question should be dealt with. The means adopted to obtain this end had been voluntary means, but the Bill now before the House proposed to go further than that, and complete the work of the Act of 1903 by applying compulsion in those cases where voluntary effort had failed. There was no need for him to quote figures to the House; with these statistics hon. Members were quite familiar. The difference between the two sides of the House was not the end they had in view and what they all desired to see fulfilled, but the means by which that end was to be brought about. The Government felt that it would be a most unhappy thing if the good intentions of the Act of 1903 were defeated for want of effectual means to carry them out. The Bill before them proposed to apply the principle of compulsion, not only in regard to untenanted land but also in regard to land occupied by tenants who happened to hold holdings from which previous tenants had been evicted. The discussion on Wednesday last wandered over a wide field and although it only disposed formally of the first three lines of Clause 1 it took so wide a range that the questions of compulsion and expropriation were fully discussed and the Chairman virtually warned the House that the discussion should be taken as disposing of these two questions. That being so there remained for further discussion the other heads of the Bill, and the time table he submitted to the House provided, in his opinion, ample time for their discussion. There was the discussion on the tribunal which was to determine the particulars of land taken compulsorily, and also to fix the amount of compensation to be awarded to dispossessed tenants; there was the question of finance, not, he thought, a very widely controversial matter; and the remaining point was the change of tenure of the Estates Commissioners. So that the net result was of the five main heads under which the Bill was founded, two of them had already been discussed, and for the remaining three substantially important subjects, the Government felt justified in coming to the conclusion that the time assigned under his Resolution would be amply sufficient. They were not altogether without experience in this matter, and whatever opinion might be entertained with regard to this time table system, in a case like the one before them it did answer its purpose, viz., to prevent aimless and unnecessary expenditure of time in general discussion; whilst, on the other hand, it gave sufficient time for discussion on each particular point, and had the effect of riveting the attention of the Committee upon those points. He submitted his Resolution to the House confident of their approval.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Committee stage and Report stage of the Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, including the Financial Resolution relating thereto, shall be proceeded with in the following manner:—(*a*) that Clauses 1 and 2 and the Committee stage of the Financial Resolution, if and so far as not previously disposed of, be proceeded with and proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the first allotted day; (*b*) that the Report stage of the Financial Resolution and the remaining clauses of the Bill, and any new Government clauses and any new Government schedules, and any other matter necessary to bring the Committee stage to a conclusion (if and so far as not previously disposed of), be proceeded with and brought to a conclusion on the second allotted day, and that the Chairman report the Bill to the House without Question put; (*c*) that one allotted day be given to the Report stage of the Bill, and that all matters necessary to bring the Report stage to a conclusion be proceeded with, and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on that day. After this order comes into operation, any day (other than Friday) shall be considered an allotted day for the purposes of this order on which the Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill is put down as the first Order of the Day, or on which any stage of the Financial Resolution relating thereto is put down as the first Order of the Day, followed by the Bill. At 10.30 p.m. on any allotted day on which proceedings on any business allotted to that day are brought to a conclusion, the Chairman or Speaker shall, if those proceedings have not already been brought to a conclusion, put forthwith the Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given, but no other Amendments, and on any Question necessary to dispose of the business to be concluded, and in the case of Government Amendments or of Government new clauses or schedules he shall put only the Question that the Amendment be made or that the clause or schedule be added to the Bill, as the case may be. Any Private Business which is set down for consideration at 8.15 p.m. on any allotted day shall, instead of being taken on that day as provided by the Standing Order "Time for taking Private Business," be taken after the conclusion of the proceedings on the Bill for that day, and any Private Business so taken may be proceeded with, though opposed, notwithstanding the Standing Order "Sittings of the House." At 11 p.m. on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order of the Day, or if that day is a Friday at 5 p.m., the Speaker shall put forthwith any Question necessary to complete the proceedings on that stage of the Bill. Proceedings to which this order relates shall not, on any day on which any proceedings or business are to be brought to a conclusion under this order, be interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to the Sittings of the House. After the passing of this order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill (including the Financial Resolution relating thereto) stand as first

Order of the Day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor Motion for Adjournment under Standing Order 10, nor Motion to pospone a clause, shall be received unless moved by a Minister of the Crown, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith without debate."—*(Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.)*

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the Prime Minister had got so accustomed to moving these Resolutions, and the House had got so familiar with them, that he did not seem to regard it as in the least necessary to make any serious attempt to defend the proposals he made. Habit had come to his assistance, and now he thought five or six minutes were enough to recommend a guillotine Resolution which formerly he and his Party spent hours in denouncing, and now he regarded it as the most natural thing in the world for the House to deprive itself, not once, but constantly and perpetually, of all its rights of discussion and debate. Sometimes the right hon. Gentleman moved it before debate had commenced at all, and sometimes after the debate had continued for a night; but he did not think the right hon. Gentleman's patience had ever extended over two nights before he came down to the House and asked them to give him these exceptional and usually abused powers. He for one had not for many years been prepared to maintain that the House could wholly do without these exceptional measures, but there was a great distinction between using them exceptionally and using them without any provocation as part of the ordinary routine business of the day. The right hon. Gentleman dealt with them as he usually dealt with the Eleven o'clock Rule, which was suspended without provocation. Those Members who had had experience of previous Parliaments would agree that, while the guillotine by compartments had been used by successive Governments for a long period, it had never been applied in the manner or to the extent to which the right hon. Gentleman now used it. He remembered two great controversial Bills, one brought in by a Radical Government, the Parish Councils Bill, and the other by a Unionist Government, the Education Bill of 1902. In the case of the Parish Councils Bill they had thirty-four days in Committee, and in the case of the Education Bill he believed they had forty days in Committee. It had been reserved to this Government in the last session and in this to come down, and without justification, reason, or adequate public necessity, and before the discussion had either begun at all or when it had gone only a little way, to say, "We cannot allow the House fully to discuss our measure; we must apply closure by compartments." The statement of the right hon. Gentleman that closure by compartments had the great advantage of concentrating the attention of the House upon the really important matters was a ludicrously inaccurate account of what took place. One of the grave objections, indeed, to this method of procedure was that it did not concentrate attention on the important parts of a Bill. There had never yet been a case to his knowledge when under such conditions the important points really had been discussed. Let them take the right hon. Gentleman's last effort in this direction, when it was moved in regard to the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill. There were vast fragments of that measure which were never discussed either in the Committee stage or on Report. Public attention was not focussed on those points, and the Government escaped the pile of criticism to which their predecessors were subjected. No doubt this procedure saved the Government—not very careful draftsmen as a rule in framing their measures—a great many of the inevitable consequences of criticism. It enabled them to escape from many difficult positions without suffering defeats at the hands, not of the Opposition, who were too small a band to be able to defeat the Government on Committee points, but of hon. Gentlemen opposite, who, although they did not always agree upon the details of the measures brought in by their leaders, did always agree in preventing those details being discussed. Their ideal was that the voting should take place in this House and all the discussion in another place—that all the power should be here and all the debates there. That was their method of filling up the cup. He thought the right hon. Gentleman, in spite of the rather airy and sanguine spirit in which he had addressed himself to his Motion, must himself be conscious that under his leadership last session and this the House had become familiar with this method of procedure, so that it now considered it part of its ordinary practice and not an exceptional measure to be debated and justified. The drug which had to be administered to the House by the previous Government, the right hon. Gentleman now gave them as their daily food. He was rather amused at the cheers which greeted the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman when he said that he was going to give ample time to the discusssion of the Bill. When he reflected on the political and Parliamentary principles of the able and energetic Party which represented the Nationalists of Ireland as to the time that ought to be taken in discussing measures, their amazing fertility of objection, their amplitude of rhetorical effort, which he was the first to recognise; when he heard them cheer the closure on an Irish Bill, dealing with Irish questions, which has been debated for eight hours, and for which only two more days were to be allowed for the Committee stage and one for Report, he was forced to say how differently they estimated the necessity for discussing a measure when Members from the North of Ireland were anxious to discuss it.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Half the Ulster Members are on our side.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that was a question it was not necesary to go into. What he was endeavouring to point out was that the same power of eloquence existed among his hon. friends who represented the North of Ireland, and they claimed the same right of discussion as hon. Members below the gangway. There should be some possibility of comparison between the two cases, some parity of treatment extended to those who represented other constituencies in Ireland. Whenever a Government responsible for business came forward with a proposal of this kind the majority would, of course, support them. But he respectfully said to the House that for two sessions now they had been on an inclined plane in respect of these measures for stopping debate. If the process was allowed to go on much longer and was allowed to become the habitual practice of the House, its powers over the details of legislation would have gone for ever. Not only was it handing over, in effect the legislation of the country in all its details to Ministers, who, conscious that their legislative efforts would not be subjected to any minute revision, would become more and more reckless, not only in form, but in the substance of the measures they brought forward, but it would add neither to the dignity, to the utility, nor to the interest of the House.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said that he had listened for a long time to the kind of speech just delivered, the indignant protest of the champion of free discussion in the House. The right hon. Gentleman was perhaps the most interesting speaker in the House, and the delight must be great of new Members of the House to hear the protests of the champion of free discussion and the solemn denunciations of the right hon. Gentleman. But it was not easy to forget the right hon. Gentleman's antecedents in this respect. He of all men in the House was a past master in bringing forward this kind of Motion. ["No, no."] For years the Nationalist and other Members had suffered from the action of the right hon. Gentleman when he was in power in depriving the House of every shred of freedom of discussion. But on the general question the right hon. Gentleman—supposing that they could take him seriously — took up a position which ought to command the serious consideration of the House. They had now come to the pass that notwithstanding all their new rules and the constant use of the closure no Government, even supported with an overwhelming majority, could hope to pass serious and contentious measures without the use of devices of this kind. The House of Commons would never recover its rights of free speech by any set of rules they chose to devise. The only way was by lightening the load of business, which weighed heavier and heavier on the House. The Irish Members had fought against coercion for Ireland and the suspension of the right of trial by jury, but when a measure was introduced to benefit Ireland the right hon. Gentleman was scandalised to find that the Nationalist Party did not offer the same kind of opposition as they had formerly offered to coercion. What was the case for or against this particular application of the closure? The right hon. Gentleman twitted the Prime Minister with having made a speech of only five minutes in justification of his proposal. But the justification of the Motion was to be found not in the five minutes speech of to-day, but in the first night's proceedings in Committee on the Bill. The proceedings of last Wednesday constituted the speech in support of this Motion. Before they were allowed to consider or discuss one single syllable in the Bill, they were met by a dilatory Motion to report progress, which they were told by the mover of it was not a serious Motion, and was only intended for the purpose of having a general discussion of those Amendments on which they desired to know what the action of the Government would be. It seemed to him to be a most irregular Motion and a most irregular discussion. But having elicited a statement from the Government they then proceeded further to discuss the Motion, and to show how earnest they were about it, they actually divided when the question was put from the Chair. What were the proceedings during the evening? The right hon. Gentleman was surprised that he himself had spoken only once. Again, the right hon. Gentleman must take them for fools. It was not only the Ulster Members. The right hon. Gentleman spoke of the necessity of giving time to the Ulster Members. Ulster Members had taken up very little time. The time was largely taken up by a number of English Members on the benches above the Opposition gangway, the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London and men of that character. The hon. Baronet would acquit him of any desire to say anything offensive to him, but what he had in his mind was the character which the hon. Baronet had given of himself at the last election, when he said to his constituents in the City of London that his great recommendation for Parliament was that he was able to speak at any time, on anything, and for any length. It was hon. Members of that kind who had continued the discussion on Wednesday and all through the evening, and it would be in the recollection of hon. Members that the Chairman of Committees had repeatedly to intervene to protest against irrelevance and repetition. And so the evening went on, and the Leader of the Opposition was surprised that he and his friends did not take a hand to help that kind of obstruction. The right hon. Gentleman had not made any case whatever against this Motion. And forsooth, he had spoken—it was laughable almost—about the precedents of the Parish Councils Bill and the Education Bill of 1902, and asked why they were only giving three days to this Bill, when thirty days were given in Committee on the Parish Councils Bill, and he did not know how many days in Committee on the Education Bill. But what possible parity was there between the two cases? This short measure was a simple Bill which merely carried into effect the pledge given by the Tory Party and the landlord party in that House in 1903 to restore the evicted tenants in Ireland to their homes, an object which they had pledged themselves to carry out, and without that pledge the Land Act of 1903, as they knew well, would never have been carried at all. On the object of the Bill the Prime Minister was right in saying there was complete agreement. Was there a man from Ulster, or the City of London, or elsewhere, who would get up and say that he was against the object of this Bill? Then it was a Bill on which they were agreed.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): I have no hesitation in getting up in my place and stating that I am utterly against the objects of this Bill, which I take to be a Bill for taking away land——

MR. JOHN REDMOND said nobody accused the hon. Gentleman of a want of courage; he was against the object of the Bill—that was, against the carrying out of the pledge given by the landlord and Tory Party in Ireland that they would, as part of the bargain of 1903, restore the evicted tenants to their farms. There were only two or three contentious points in the Bill. One of them was the question of compulsion. As the Prime Minister had rightly said, that was discussed at great length, a decision was come to, and the Chairman of Committees declared that he would not permit a second discussion on the point. The next great contentious principle was that compulsion should be applied to that class of men who were called "grabbers" or "planters" in Ireland. That also was discussed at great length, a decision was come to upon it and it was disposed of. All that remained to be discussed was the tribunal to decide upon the price, the alteration of the tenure of the Estates Commissioners, and one or two comparatively trifling matters in addition. He therefore asserted that the serious and important questions had already been discussed and decided.

MR. MEYSEY-THOMPSON (Staffordshire, Handsworth): I rise to order. I wish to correct a statement.

*MR. SPEAKER: This is not the time to correct a statement. If the hon. Member wishes to do that the House, I am sure, will hear him afterwards.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said that he had practically finished. He merely wished to say that the really contentious points in the Bill, certainly the most serious and contentious, had been disposed of. The remaining points could easily be disposed of after the fullest amount of discussion in the time proposed by the Resolution, and when the right hon. Gentlemen indicated as he did in his speech that really the Motion was not necessary at all, and that there was no intention to have a long discussion, and that without the Motion the discussion would be confined within proper limits—if that was his view and it had been communicated to the Government this Motion would never have been moved. But they were in this position. They were coming to the end of the session. It was a matter of the most vital importance in Ireland for the sake not only of the limited class of people known as the evicted tenants, but of the whole country and the peace of the whole country during the coming winter that this Bill should be passed, and the Government would be wanting in their duty if they hesitated to take steps to secure that it would be passed within a reasonable time. He trusted that under the circumstances the House would pass the Bill, that they would pass it speedily, and that with that object in view they would come to the calm consideration of those portions of the Bill which remained to be discussed. Besides, they would find it was only a small section of the Irish Members who had any objection to the Bill, that the opposition came largely from English Members and that not only the West and South of Ireland, but almost the entire representation of Ireland in that House, with very few exceptions, was anxious to see it carried into law.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford) said they had not been given a single instance where a guillotine Motion of this character had been brought forward under similar circumstances, and before such a proposal was submitted they ought to have been furnished with some precedent for bringing it forward in such a manner. So far as the actual Bill was concerned, he thought they had received a sufficient answer both in the speeches of the Prime Minister and the hon. and learned Member for Waterford, because the right hon. Gentleman, supported by the hon. and learned Gentleman, had said that on Wednesday the two great principles of the Bill had been disposed of; and after that statement no one could accuse those on that side of the House of having been guilty of obstruction in discussing the proposals of the measure. But with his great experience, the right hon Gentleman knew that the Second Reading was the occasion for raising objections to principle, and in Committee they had to deal with the details, to which many hon. Members at once saw reason to object, some of them being entirely novel. Two or three things had happened this session which really lifted this matter into a rather different light. They had recently had a discussion, the text of which was that the voice of the House of Commons ought to prevail; but the Government had consistently said in connection with every important Bill they had brought forward, not that the voice of the House of Commons was to prevail, but that it was to be muzzled in order to prevent proper discussion. Under the closure by allotted days the questions on which the Government had difficulties were nearly always relegated to that particular half-hour in the evening when they had their majority behind them, when arguments could not be used, and when the Opposition were powerless. It was rather curious that the Government which said that the voice of the House of Commons should prevail had done so much to remove legislation from the control of the House by preventing discussion. The debate on the Standing Orders was guillotined, and when Bills were allowed to remain in Committee of the Whole House, as, for example, the Army Bill, the Insect Pests Bill, and now the Evicted Tenants Bill, the use of the guillotine prevented that full consideration and discussion which they had a right to claim. They were bound to refer to these considerations which had arisen for the first time this session. They were quite justified in asking for a fuller explanation from the Prime Minister, who had been so closely connected with matters relating to procedure in the House. What was there to make this subject a matter of urgency? There had been no obstruction this session and no waste of time; therefore, the entire responsibility was with the Government, because they had allowed the session to get nearly to the end of July without bringing forward their Bills. The Government had mismanaged their programme, and the Prime Minister was now asking for an entirely new form of procedure. He thought they were fully justified in opposing this attempt to guillotine all reasonable discussion.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG remarked that the Prime Minister in moving the Motion had said that all parties in the House were practically agreed upon the object of the Bill. He thought Unionist Members for Ireland and Unionst Members generally had made it amply plain that they were not so agreed. If they were all agreed upon the matter where would be the necessity for the Resolution? The hon. Member for Waterford had endeavoured to convince the House that the object of the Bill was simply to reinstate evicted tenants. That was the object of the Bill of 1903; the object of this Bill was to allow the Estates Commissioners to acquire tenanted and other land compulsorily. It was misleading the House to say that the primary and essential object of the Bill was the reinstatement of evicted tenants. It was upon those two grounds chiefly that Unionist Members, and especially Irish Unionist Members, objected to the Bill, and, therefore, to any closure by compartment Resolution being passed in respect of it. The hon. Member for Waterford had called it a short, simple Bill, but it contained some seventeen or eighteen clauses introducing the new principle of compulsion in the acquisition of land in Ireland, which everybody knew perfectly well would lead from providing land for evicted tenants to providing land for congested districts, and thence in a short time to the transference of land generally from the landlord to the tenant. That might be all right and proper, but he and his friends maintained that that was a question of such magnitude and a question so directly excluded from the Act of 1903, that a Bill containing that principle should be given the fullest discussion. The discussion should not be cut down to a paltry day or two as was proposed. They all knew why the Government had proposed the Resolution. The chief reason was that they had delayed to such an inordinately late time the introduction of the Bill. The House would agree with him that to introduce one of the first-class measures of the session at such a late day was not fair. It was not to be expected that the Bill could receive due and proper discussion if the session was to end at anything like the ordinary time. He had tried to point out to the House at the earlier stages of the Bill that it was not asked for. The evicted tenants clauses in the Act of 1903 were working to the satisfaction of everybody except apparently the Chief Secretary for Ireland, the Estates Commissioners, and the hon. Member for Waterford. Everybody else realised that those clauses were doing all that was expected of them. It seemed to be very much out of place for the hon. Member for Waterford to get up each day as he had done in the various debates on the Bill, and to throw the onus on Unionist Members for opposing the Bill. The reasonable view which the hon. and learned Member for Waterford ought to take was that they were precluded from asking for the powers conferred by this Bill because at the passing of the Act of 1903 they were given a measure which came up to their demands and expectations, and under which a very much larger number of evicted tenants had been provided for than the Nationalist Party ever thought existed. During the debates upon the Bill of 1903 the number of evicted tenants to be provided for was put at between 400 and 800, but the Chief Secretary had informed them that already over 1,000 had been dealt with under that Act. The Unionist Members from Ireland, although they were comparatively few, represented one-third of the population, and they maintained that there was no necessity for the Bill. The Act of 1903, every line of which was agreed to by Nationalists and Liberals alike, was accepted as a settlement, and from that day to this there had been no demand made that compulsory powers should be given to the Estates Commissioners. That body seemed to have suddenly discovered a pressing necessity for compulsory powers, although they were receiving daily accounts from both landlords and tenants in Ireland of the hardships and the injustice which were being inflicted under the present system of reinstating these tenants. He could cite cases in which the most undesirable class of tenants were being reinstated—men who owed from six to nine year's rent, not on account of any political fight, but simply because they had turned out to be quite incapable of farming their land to advantage. For those reasons he failed to see where the necessity arose for giving the Commissioners greater powers than they now possessed. The Prime Minister had said the necessity for such a Bill as this was agreed to by all sides of the House, but it passed his comprehension how any person could make such a statement as that, because the Unionist Members from Ireland had opposed the Bill strenously on the First Reading and upon each succeeding stage. The right hon. Gentleman had harped upon the old point that they all desired to see the evicted tenants reinstated. It was quite true that they all desired to see the respectable evicted tenants reinstated, but he contended that the greater number of them had already been reinstated, and therefore there was no necessity to grant compulsory powers for the purpose. They also objected to the Bill because of the power which it gave and which they maintained would be exercised—although the Chief Secretary desired that the power should not be exercised—by the Estates Commissioners to turn out perfectly respectable new tenants who were now occupying farms formerly in possession of evicted tenants. He and his friends sincerely believed, and in fact it was admitted the other night by the Attorney-General for Ireland, that many of these so-called new tenants would be turned out bag and baggage and that other farms would be provided for them. The Unionist Members could not stand by and see a law passed which would enable two or three Commissioners to go down to such a man as he had described and say, "You must leave this farm because the man who had it before you desires to come back. So far as we can see there can be no hope of peace in this district so long as you occupy the farm." The Chief Secretary described this man as obstinate and as a centre of disturbance. He and his friends took the view that if one of these farms was held in a legal way and especially if he——

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member's remarks refer to the provisions of the Bill, and they are not relevant to the Resolution now before the House.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said he would only add that they had been told that the two great questions of compulsion and the taking of untenanted land had been fully discussed the other day. He did not admit that. The discussion of those two great principles was disposed of in seven hours, and it was because the Prime Minister's Resolution would shorten debate on the most important points that he objected to it.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.) called attention to the fact that forty Members were not present. House counted; and, forty Members being found present—

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said he resented the tone in which the Prime Minister said it would be an unhappy thing if the good intentions of the Act of 1903 should fail. The right hon. Gentleman had based his proposal for the undue limitation of the discussion of this Bill on the desire that the failure of the Act of 1903 should be prevented. He could tell the Prime Minister that he had heard different stories in regard to the Act of 1903. It was not failing; it was doing its work well, subject to one drawback, namely, that they had not enough money to carry it out. If the right hon. Gentleman would only give the Act of 1903—the evicted tenants clauses as well as the others—a fair trial for a few years, not only would the tenants of Ireland become owners of their farms, but the evicted tenants would be quietly and satisfactorily settled on holdings.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.) said the hon. Member for South Antrim made a number of well-reasoned speeches the other day in which he pointed out with perfect truth that the substance of this Bill was to be found in the compulsory powers to reinstate the evicted tenants and in the compulsory powers given to the tribunal to acquire untenanted land. He stated his objection to both these things with great argumentative force, and he was quite justified in doing so. The hon. Gentleman had repeated his objections to day. He had said he vehemently objected to the Bill, and of course he was entitled to object. But the fact that he objected to the Bill was no reason why he should go on repeating day after day the badness of the Bill. The badness of a Bill was not the measure of the length of time at which it should be discussed. The House had discussed the Bill on the Second Reading and on the first day of the Committee stage. On those occasions the two most important points were discussed at such length as to disentitle him or any other Members to reopen or repeat those points. It was a mistake for the Opposition to think that because the Bill was a bad one they should be allowed great length of time for its discussion. The only difficulty he felt about the Motion of the Prime Minister was that it almost seemed to be something in the nature of an insult to the House to suppose that any rational body of men would wish to occupy more than three days in the discussion of what was left of this measure. Of course, as he had said already, if the vehemence of the Opposition entailed weeks and months of discussion, the debate might go on to the crack of doom. When they had discussed one point let them proceed to the next. All he could say was that, if three days were not enough for the Committee stage and the Report stage of this Bill, then there was an end of Parliamentary discussion in that House. They could not carry out business if great length of time was devoted to the discussion, not of the principle of compulsion or the power of the Estates Commissioners in certain cases to restore evicted tenants to their old holdings, even although they were now in the occupation of other tenants, but simply what was left, namely, who where the Commissioners to whom the duty should be entrusted, what power of appeal there should be from those men, the financial arrangements for the working out of the Bill, and the tenure of the Estates Commissioners. If they could not discuss those points in two whole days then it was all up with Parliamentary discussion, and a Resolution of this kind became a Parliamentary necessity. The late Government gave in regard to the Aliens Bill a corresponding length of time, and hon. Gentlemen said then that it would be a bad precedent. The late Government did not care; they had to get the Bill through, and they got it through. If the House wasted time as they were doing at present on the Resolution which might be devoted to the discussion of the measure itself, then he quite agreed that the guillotine would fall. It ought to be the object of the House to give a reasonable time only for the discussion of Parliamentary measures. The Government knew perfectly well that they could not hope to get the Bill through in two or three days, and so they had most reluctantly to come to the House in order to be armed with the power. He was afraid the time given to the House would be largely wasted. Members on the Opposition side would discuss not the important but the unimportant points, and it might be therefore that the Bill would go to the House of Lords with some matters undiscussed which might very well have been discussed. That would not be the fault of the Government. With reference to the statement that the Bill might have been introduced at an earlier date, he had to say that it could not have been introduced earlier because the Government had not the material. They created an extra staff and put the Treasury to great expense in order to find out the facts, and they brought in the Bill as early as they could. The House had already discussed the two main principles of the Bill. Nothing remained but the machinery, and the time they allowed the House to discuss the machinery was ample. He challenged hon. Gentlemen to say that they had not left ample time for the discussion of the proposals of the Bill if the House would only devote the time to those points and not to idle irrelevant matters.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) said he was sorry that the Government had found themselves unable to agree. The Prime Minister had told the House a few minutes ago that one of the results of this Motion would be that full time would be given to the discussion of the more important points of the Bill.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said he hoped that would be so.

MR. WALTER LONG expressed the hope that the Prime Minister would not be disappointed. He was directing attention to the fact that the Chief Secretary did not share the view of the Prime Minister. The Chief Secretary had just stated that he thought the time would be devoted to irrelevent discussions and that no notice would be taken at all of the more important points.

MR. BIRRELL: I am afraid so.

MR. WALTER LONG said he thought the Prime Minister and the Chief Secretary might arrive at an agreement as to the effect of the Resolution before they came before the House. The Chief Secretary had stated that the Aliens Bill was a precedent for the course they were now taking. But that was exactly the contrary of the fact. The Aliens Bill was given five days in Committee and in addition the closure Motion was not moved until the Bill had been three days in Committee, showing that there was a marked difference between what was done in regard to the Aliens Bill and what was now proposed. The Chief Secretary had complained somewhat unnecessarily that the present short debate was a waste of Parliamentary time. If that meant anything, it meant that the comment was well founded that the Government in future were to select their own legislation, and, having passed it by their Party majority through the Second Reading stage, they, without waiting to see what the attitude of the Opposition might be to the measure, were to decide what share of Parliamentary time was to be devoted to its consideration. He saw no waste of time whatever in considering a proposal of this kind. He was astonished to hear the hon. Member for Waterford speak as he had done with regard to the position of the Unionist Party with reference to this question. He had told them that they were prepared to object to any measure intended for the benefit of Ireland. He could hardly believe his ears when he heard that statement. The hon. Gentleman knew perfectly well that they had passed many measures for the benefit of Ireland. But in reference to this particular case, while they accepted the principle repeatedly with regard to reinstating the evicted tenants with whom they were dealing in 1903—while they agreed that these should be reinstated, they never agreed that powers of so wholesale a character should be placed in the hands of any body in order to carry out a reinstatement which had gone many leagues beyond anything ever contemplated by any Party in the last Parliament. It had been said that the Motion of the hon. Member for North Armagh (in Committee, to report Progress) was dilatory. It was nothing of the kind. The Motion was meant to ascertain what were the intentions of the Government, and they had succeeded beyond their imagination. The Chief Secretary had complained that they had debated the two main principles of the Bill, and stated that all the rest of the Bill was mere machinery. He was astonished that the Chief Secretary should have said that the question of an appeal to a tribunal for fixing the purchase price was a matter of machinery. He did not think that the Chairman of Committees would support the view the right hon. Gentleman had advanced in regard to Clause 1. The ruling of the Chairman was that if they moved to reject Clause 1 all further references to the question of compulsion would be precluded. But in order to show that they were trying to meet the direction of the Chairman, they took the course which the Chairman thought would meet the interests of debate; they did not move to omit that clause, and they made a Motion for a direct debate on compulsion. But the Chief Secretary knew full well that there were parts of the Bill which they were now approaching, in which a great deal more than machinery was involved. What had to be considered was the form of the machinery by which effect was to be given to these compulsory powers. The Chief Secretary had stated that they were wasting the time of the House in asking that more time should be given, but in what the Chief Secretary called "mere machinery" they had to consider the not only existing rights of the owners of the land, who no doubt would have short shrift, but the rights of the existing tenants who had hitherto had advocates on the other side of the House, who were now prepared to hand them over to the more clamorous demands of the original tenants. The way in which those powers were to be exercised, the way in which those men were to be safeguarded, if the object of the Bill was to heal the sore—all these were not matters of machinery. Some of them were of vital importance to the existing tenants, many of whom were as poor as the tenants the Government were now asking to restore to their old holdings, and time ought to be given for their discussion. So far as he was concerned, he did not believe that in the debates that took place the other day a single Member on the Opposition side of the House advanced an argument which was not directly germane to the questions under discussion and practical. The proof of that was that the debates both days were brought to a conclusion in the ordinary way without the Minister in charge having to move the closure. That supported his view that there was not the slightest intention on the Opposition side of the House to do anything but put the case of those they represented before the House. That was the view which governed them last week and would govern them still. He regretted that the Government had found it necessary to intervene at this stage with a Motion of this kind without waiting to see what demands on the time of the House were likely to be made; and if there was time wasted the blame and the responsibility would rest on those who had initiated it.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) said that the hon. Member for Waterford had referred in almost indignant terms of protest to the fact that certain Unionist Members for England had tried to take part in the discussion. He ventured to protest, on the other hand, that this was still the United Kingdom. They had not yet passed a Home Rule Bill. As a representative of an English constituency he considered he had a perfect right to criticise any measure which affected any part of the United Kingdom. Hon. Members below the gangway did not hesitate to take part in debates on English Bills, and he did not see why English Members should not take an intelligent interest in Irish affairs. The Prime Minister in introducing this Resolution said he did not think that there ought to be any serious opposition to it, because they, on the Opposition side of the House, as a Party, were committed to the reinstatement of the evicted tenants. He was not in the House when the Land Act of 1903 was passed, but he understood that the Conservative Party were pledged only to reinstate the evicted tenants on the campaign estates. The hon. Member for East Mayo had then stated that there never had been more than 800 evicted tenants, and that these had been reduced to 400; and therefore when the Government were going to force through in a high-handed manner a measure to reinstate 2,000 he did not think that they were acting unreasonably if they protested. They had decided two important points—that the principle of compulsion should be applied generally, and applied not only to untenanted but to tenanted land. There were, however, certain very important principles yet to be settled, such as who was to decide what money was to be given for an estate. The Bill embodied for the first time in history that the person who bought land was also to fix the price. Then the Bill was going to divert money which had been devoted to a certain purpose by the Act of 1903, to another purpose. If the Resolution were passed the *status* of the Estates Commissioners and the tribunal to decide what amount of money was to be given would never be discussed. The real reason why the Bill had been brought forward was that it was necessary to the Government and to hon. Members below the gangway. Without it the Government could not have the support of the Irish Party, or at any rate, the benefit of their neutrality; and the Irish Party, whose political repute had been somewhat blown upon, would get their consolation prize after the fiasco of the Irish Council Bill, and be able to go back to their constituents with something in their hands.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) said that the hon. Member for Waterford had stated that if this Bill was opposed on that side of the House they would be going back on the express pledges and undertakings given by the Tory Party in 1903. He most strongly objected to the Bill of that year as the worst ever introduced into the House of Commons, and voted against both the Second and the Third Readings. The present proceedings showed the futility of the former Bill. The proposal as to the allocation of time would, however, not only affect the Evicted Tenants Bill but the Water Board Bill for the Metropolis. The latter was fixed for to-morrow at a quarter past eight o'clock, but hon. Members interested in it would under this Resolution have to discuss it in the early hours of the morning. That was a double reason for objecting to the course which the Prime Minister asked the House to pursue. He had been a good many years in the House, and he never recollected closure by compartments being applied so brutally as it had been this session. They had had on this Bill one day's discussion, and the hon. and learned Member for Waterford said that that was because it contained one vital principle. He did not deny that the principle of the Bill was vital to Ireland, but it might also be applied to England. Hon. Members below the gangway on that side were not interested in England, while hon. Members above the gangway opposite were desirous of purchasing the support of hon. Members below the gangway on that side. [Cries of "Oh."] Well he would say "acquiring." He did not want to be offensive. "Purchase" was a question of barter, and there was no doubt the support of hon. Gentlemen below the gangway would be given in consequence of this Bill. He would, however, use the word "acquiring." Hon. Members like himself, sitting above the gangway on the Opposition side of the House, were therefore more likely to be fair-minded with regard to this question than other hon. Members, because they had nothing to gain and nothing to lose in regard to it. All they desired was that justice should be done. He had no desire to obstruct the Bill; on the contrary, he wanted to get away. The Government ought not to be allowed to curtail discussion in this way. They might say that they did it because the end of July was approaching, but the hon. and learned Member for Waterford insinuated that if Ireland had been granted Home Rule there would have been no congestion of business. Irish business had, however, occupied very little of the time of the House this session, with the exception of the abortive discussion on the Irish Council Bill. The real reason was to be found in the *Westminster Gazette*, which, quoting from the Patronage Secretary, said the Government had put in their programme enough to last for three sessions. That was a Radical organ which agreed with the opinion of a gentleman who ought to know the condition of affairs better than anybody else. This Bill was not even in the King's Speech, but yet at the end of July the Government introduced the closure in order to prevent discussion on it. Under the new regulation the greater part of the Committee business of the House was done in another place, but they hoped that when measures were considered of sufficient importance to be dealt with in Committee in the House of Commons they would have a reasonable opportunity of discussion. They found, however, that the conditions which prevailed upstairs were to prevail in that House. If the Government had nothing to say in support of their Bills the closure was resorted to, and Bills were to be forced through without adequate discussion. He did not agree with the contention of hon. Gentlemen opposite, that the House of Lords should have nothing to say in regard to Bills which had passed the House of Commons, but if they were not allowed to discuss the matter there, and the House of Lords were abolished, right hon. Gentlemen sitting on the Front Bench would be responsible to no one but themselves. The question was a much more important one than that of forcing the Evicted Tenants Bill through, because the Government had come to the conclusion that it was not only necessary for them to introduce a Bill, but that if they introduced a Bill it was to be forced through without discussion, without an opportunity being given to the country of knowing what it was about, simply because a Radical Government had fathered the Bill. He had great belief in the privileges of the House of Commons, and considered that all their privileges were due to the free discussion and debate which had been in the past allowed. He denied that the Leader of the Opposition had done a great deal to curtail the freedom of discussion in that House. The right hon. Gentleman had given great latitude for discussion to the Party opposite, and although he was rather opposed to the alterations which his right hon. friend made in the rules in 1902, those alterations did not stifle discussion in anything like the way which was now attempted. He was afraid that their voices and their protests would be useless, but all he could say was that if right hon. Gentlemen opposite could not do better than this in regard to business, it was time they gave way to a Government which could carry on business in the old-fashioned way, because he believed the feeling of the country was not in favour of the rights of minorities being ignored.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping) said he was not going to enter upon the stormy path of Irish affairs, as he had never trodden it, perhaps wisely, but there was a point of view which came home to him in regard to this matter. There was an English Land Bill before the House, and he supposed the same measure which was being dealt out to this Bill would be dealt out to that. The Prime Minister had said that there would be no hardship on hon. Members in the course pursued in this case, as the principles had been adequately discussed, and plenty of time had been allowed for the discussion of details. His experience in land legislation was, however, that the details were the most important part of the Bill. Liberty of speech had always been allowed in the House of Commons. The hon. and learned Member for Waterford had twitted his right hon. friend with choking discussion, but the measures which he took paled before the Resolution before the House. The point taken by his hon. friend as to the effect this Resolution would have upon important private business was a most important one, because Members would be invited to discuss an intricate question after eleven o'clock at night. He knew that the same proposals would be applied to the English measure, and that affected him, and "out of the fulness of the heart the mouth speaketh." Therefore he made this protest.

MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.) fully agreed with the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition in reference to the Resolution and was surprised to find the Prime Minister saying that this Bill was generally agreed upon, and that if it were not passed the good intentions of the Land Act of 1903 would be defeated. Such a statement coming from the Prime Minister was a little astounding, as the number of evicted tenants reinstated under that Act considerably exceeded the expectations entertained at the time and the number which were supposed to be in existence. They were told that the provisions of the last Act so far as they affected evicted tenants had broken down; but in view of that fact that could not be so. The hon. and learned Member for Waterford had said he was always in favour of free discussion, but when they on that side asked to have a discussion on the Chief Secretary's Vote, the hon. and learned Gentleman and his followers below the gangway were pressing on the Government that the discussion of the Vote for a Department which occupied a secondary place in Irish public affairs should have precedence. It therefore appeared that the hon. and learned Gentleman was only interested in free discussion when he was interested in a measure. He entirely disagreed with the suggestion that had been made that the purposes of this discussion did not appertain, and were not proper, to the operations of the Bill under debate. He represented an agricultural constituency, and he protested against this Bill very strongly because it laid aside the case of the rent-paying, self-respecting farmer in favour of the farmer who did not recognise any moral or honourable obligations. Who were the evicted tenants on whose behalf this extreme piece of legislation was being pressed upon the House? It was wanted for those who were described as "wounded soldiers in the land war;" but they should be provided for by those who caused them to be wounded. They knew the Nationalist Party funds were now in a very prosperous state.

*MR. SPEAKER said the hon. Member's remarks did not appear to be in order.

MR. BARRIE said he, of course, bowed to the ruling of the Chair, and would conclude by saying that he only wished to protest in the strongest possible manner against a measure which affected every class in Ireland.

MR. T. L. CORBETT said there was one thing that could be said in favour of the Motion—it was thoroughly logical. Its one object appeared to be to strangle all debate, and bring the House of Commons into abject contempt. It carried out the theory of the Government that the work of the House of Commons was simply to register the opinions of this wisest of all Governments, the Government which could win no by-elections. The burning zeal felt for the Bill was shown by the attendance of Members in the House. Only a short time since he counted nine Members in the House—three of them Nationalists, and one Labour Member. Everyone knew that the Bill was a mere sop to buy off the Nationalist Party. All the Members from the North of Ireland, as trustees for their constituents who had been described in the past as the "lonely loyalists," felt that it was their duty to see that the Bill did not rob them. If the Government wanted to do something generous for the men who were finding support at the hands of the Nationalists let them not do it at the expense of the loyal constituencies. It should be done by the Nationalist Party who were able to find funds from all parts of the world. He protested against this attempt to silence discussion.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL (Dublin University) challenged the proposition of the Prime Minister that the principle of the Bill had been admitted on all sides of the House. There was an agreement that it was a desirable thing that the question of the evicted tenants should be adjusted by fair, honourable, and honest means, and that principle was agreed upon in the Act of 1903. What they agreed upon was to be found in an Act of Parliament. [MR. BIRRELL: Why did you not carry it out?] If the only way of carrying out the concordat of 1903 was that which the Government were taking they had a very curious notion of carrying out their duty in respect to it. The concordat in 1903, agreed to in terms by hon. Gentlemen below the gangway and hon. Gentlemen opposite, distinctly promised as an essential condition of the settlement by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover, who was in charge of the Bill, that there was to be no compulsion of any kind. It was all to be carried out as a matter of free bargain; and the hon. and learned Member for Waterford and the hon. Member for East Mayo went out of their way to reiterate to the House that they would be no party to any demand for compulsion as against so-called "grabbers" or "planters." It was therefore ludicrous to say that the Bill was merely carrying out the principle already adopted, and embodied in the Act of 1903, which had been steadily and successfully administered ever since on the line of no compulsion and free bargaining. There had been no suggestion in any part of the House that the other great object of the Act of 1903, namely, the conversion of ordinary tenants into purchasing owners, was in any way to give priority to the question of evicted tenants; the settlement was effected on the lines that these objects were to run *pari passu* without preference being given to either in favour of the other. The hon. and learned Member had said that the object of the Bill was merely to carry out the pledges given in 1903. For the first time in his experience the hon. and learned Gentleman and his Party behind him were, he regretted to have to say, themselves deliberately and flagrantly violating an honourable pledge given in 1903. That pledge had been referred to over and over again, not merely in the House but in another place. Everyone knew perfectly well that had it not been for a distinct and honourable agreement that there was to be no sort of compulsion for the restoration of evicted tenants, the provision made in the Act of 1903 for these tenants would not have escaped criticism nor received the support it had obtained from all parts of the House. Therefore, he denied that this Bill in any shape or form was carrying out the Act of 1903; on the contrary, it was a violation of the principle of the Act. The hon. and learned Member for Waterford in reply to the Leader of the Opposition, who had spoken of the changed attitude of Members below the gangway on the question of the closure, had said that their opposition to closure had been in connection with coercion Bills. But what was there in the Bill under discussion but coercion? There never was introduced a Bill which contained more of the principle of coercion than the present measure; compulsion was to be found in every clause of it, from beginning to end. It proposed to compel the landlords to part with their property and to compel the sitting tenants to surrender their holdings. If that was not a measure of coercion he did not know what was. If the hon. and learned Gentleman and his followers were consistent, this was a measure of coercion which they should oppose. The coercion of the Unionist Government was coercion against crime and criminals; but here, they had coercion against law-abiding and peaceful citizens. It was coercion against men who had broken no law; it was coercion for the purpose of plunder, to take one man's property and pass it on to another, and to turn out existing tenants and put in their place men who had broken their contracts. The Prime Minister had said that the principle of the Bill was admitted on all sides. He challenged him to refer to any Member on that side who had ever said he was in favour of compulsion. He believed he was himself the only one who had referred to that question, and what he had said was that if the Government could not accomplish the restoration of these evicted tenants in a reasonable time without compulsion, and if they brought in a Bill for that purpose, giving the fullest and amplest protection to the owners and sitting tenants, even at the sacrifice of a principle which he valued, he should, if necessity were shown, be prepared to give the matter favourable consideration. But from beginning to end there had been no suggestion by any Member who took part in the debate on his side of the House that they would tolerate for one instant the principle of compulsion. The Chief Secretary said they had already discussed the two main principles of the Bill. He urged, however, that apart from principles, they refused time to discuss such important points as the constitution of the tribunal, the finance of the Bill, and the tenure of the Estates Commissioners. It seemed to him that apart from these great principles they must discuss the terms on which they were to be carried out: they had been left no time in which to discuss the rest of the provisions of the Bill under which this power of compulsion was to be exercised. What was to be the compensation for the land, or how was the cost to be provided for? These were all matters of great importance, once the principle was admitted. For instance, there was the expropriation of the new tenants. Were they or were they not to act upon the pledge given in another place that *bona fide* farmers were not to be disturbed? Was not that a matter worthy of discussion? If the Amendments with regard to compulsion and expropriation were to be discussed at any decent or reasonable length it would be impossible to have any time left for the discussion of the other three great principles involved—the constitution of the tribunal, the finance, and the tenure of the Estates Commissioners. He had been rather astonished to hear the Prime Minister say that the second great object of the Bill was to get rid of the sitting tenant if he happened to have a holding from which a former tenant had been evicted. Were they then to understand that every sitting tenant in the occupation of a holding from which a former tenant had been evicted, was to be turned out?

*MR. SPEAKER pointed out that the hon. Gentleman was going aside to discuss the Bill, and was not discussing the Motion before the House.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said he had desired to point out that the statement of the Chief Secretary that *bona fide* farmers would not be disturbed was in conflict with the statement of the Prime Minister. Alarm had also been created by the statement of the Attorney-General for Ireland that it was desirable to get rid of these sitting tenants because they were centres of disturbance. That involved a question of the grossest injustice and hardship to individuals, and he and those around him considered that the time at their disposal was not sufficient to enable them to obtain justice for these tenants unless they got an assurance from the right hon. Gentleman opposite that he intended to insert somewhere in his Bill a provision which would carry out what he had declared was his object, namely, to protect all the sitting tenants who could show that they were *bona fide* farmers, carrying on the cultivation of their farms. Even now if they could receive some assurance as to the course it was intended to take as regarded the tribunal set up under the Bill, the limitations in reference to the new tenants, and the principle upon which compensation to the owner was to be provided for they might be able, within reasonable limits, to confine the discussion to the period suggested. So long as they were left in the dark as to the intention of the Government with regard to the Bill, it was impossible for them to forego, so long as they could exercise it, their right of discussing in the fullest way every single Amendment of which they had given notice. For his own part, he had put down no Amendment on the Paper for dilatory purposes. The only one he had put down was one which he thought would remove some of the injustice which the Bill would otherwise perpetrate. So long as the rules of the House and the Motion permitted, he and his friends would insist upon their right to discuss all the Amendments in the fullest and most ample manner.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 293; Noes, 85. (Division List No. 296.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brodie, H. C.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Flynn, James Christopher
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.)
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Harworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.

Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan,J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray. James
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearce, William(Limehouse)
Pearson,W.H.M.(Suffolk,Eye)
Philipps,Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps,J.Wynford(Pembroke
Philipps,Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price,RobertJohn(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards,T.F.(Wolverhampt'n)
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson,Rt.Hn.E.(Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F.(Leitrim,S.)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley,Hn.A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Tennant,SirEdward(Salisbury)
Thomas,SirA.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E.
Thorne, William
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walton, SirJohn L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward,W.Dudley(Southampton
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Whitbread, Howard
White,J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley,John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn.A.J. (CityLond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring,Capt.Hn.G(Winchester)
Barrie, H.T.(Londonderry,N.)
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt.Hon.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,CharlesCurtis(Antrim, S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V.(Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gretton, John
Hardy,Laurence (Kent,Ashford
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Hunt, Rowland
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hon.Col.W.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood,Rt.Hn. Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long,Col. CharlesW.(Evesham)
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S).
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Middlemore,JohnThrogmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend
Pease,HerbertPike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)

Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland - Hood and Viscount Valentia.

TELEGRAPH (MONEY) BILL.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

*MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) said he was sorry that the Postmaster-General was not in his place. He moved the rejection of this Bill as a protest against the manner in which the right hon. Gentleman had conducted it through Committee and on Report. On the Motion for the Second Reading he moved an Amendment asking that accounts should be produced "showing the financial results of the past working of the Post Office telegraphs and telephones judged from the standpoint of an ordinary commercial undertaking." The Postmaster-General in reply was most conciliatory, and promised to consider during the recess how the accounts could be presented in a more lucid way. The House had a right to ask that this promise should be redeemed in the spirit as well as in the letter, but the Postmaster-General, by refusing to accept Amendments in Committee and on Report, had placed himself outside the control of the House. If he chose he might simply produce another official statement. The present official statement was absolutely useless. If they deducted from the total sum the amount attributed to telephones they would find an enormous increase in telegraph expenditure, although during the past five years there had been an actual reduction in the number sent. The number of telegrams had fallen from 90,500,000 to 89,500,000, and the cost had gone up to £42 per 1,000 as compared with £36 six years ago. The Postmaster-General was in this dilemma, either the telegraphs had been badly managed or the telegrams accounts had been overloaded to show a profit on the telephones accounts. That proved to him that what was wanted was something more than an official statement. What was wanted was an overhauling of the Post Office accounts by a competent business man. But there was no guarantee at present that there would be anything of the kind. The Postmaster-General in the Second Reading debate said in the most conciliatory and courteous manner that he welcomed the discussion that was raised, and said it would strengthen his hands in dealing with the claims made upon him by outsiders; but suddenly he changed his attitude, and the only explanation he knew was that the right hon. Gentleman found that the Bill, instead of going before Committee of the Whole House, was to go to a Standing Committee, where it was disposed of in five minutes. Therefore he contended that he was justified in opposing the Third Reading, because there was no guarantee that they would get the proper statement of accounts which had been promised. He was surprised that a Money Bill of such a character, next to the Finance Bill the most important Money Bill of the session, should be sent to a Standing Committee. It seemed to him that that was against the intention with which the Committee procedure was instituted. There were a good many Bills about which they made a fuss on both sides of the House, and which in a few years would be entirely forgotten, whereas this was a Bill to extract £6,000,000 from the pockets of the taxpayers. No doubt, certain concessions were made in the drafting of the Bill, but they were to the advantage of the Government. No better illustration of the evils of legislation by reference could be furnished than the disclosure, when the Postmaster-General came to put the clause on paper, of the fact that the reference would have re-enacted something to which the Treasury had strong objection. It further showed the carelessness of the officials in drafting the Bill. They were not business men, and this business Department was so mismanaged that it was a big business failure. It would be invidious to mention present officials, but there had been many distinguished men connected with the Department who were yet quite unqualified by previous training for the duties that fell to them. To mention two names, there was Sir Spencer Walpole, a distinguished man who had written a valuable history of England, and who had served as the Governor of the Isle of Man, and again there was Mr. Buxton Forman, who had edited a life of Shelley; these were men of great capacity, but they were not business men. The appointment of the latter to the Post Office was jocularly defended on the ground that he was "a man of letters." But Post Office officials had to deal with shrewd business men in the matter of contracts, and the purchase of materials and of patent rights. They had the disposal of £19,000,000 a year of public money. Yet they could not even draft a Bill; they could not do a sum in simple interest; and they could not give the same figures for the same item on different pages. He did not think it was at all surprising that money was lost in connection with the Post Office at an ever-increasing rate. The accounts and the whole conduct of the business showed that the officials were not qualified for the work. This was shown in the 3d. a mile express messages system. Upon this the Department lost money, while at the same time competing against its own 6d. telegrams. So also with the telephone charges on short distance trunk lines; though the cost was greater the charge was lower. The charge was 3d. for twenty-five miles and 6d. for fifty miles for a three-minute service, whereas a telegram which occupied the wires for less than half a minute cost sixpence. In this way the Postmaster-General was actually using the nation's capital invested in telephones to destroy the nation's capital invested in telegraphs. If these matters were left to private enterprise, one set of capitalists would ruin the other, and that was the desire, he understood, of the Labour party, while the whole nation would profit. But in this case, owing to the false policy of compelling the State to undertake this business, it was the taxpayers who paid, and taxes were laid on the necessaries of life to make up loss on telegraph and telephone services. It was an interesting illustration of what was meant by State Socialism to find the Labour Party walking into the Government lobby like a flock of sheep in support of a Bill calculated to subsidise the rich at the expense of the poor. He moved the rejection of the Bill.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College) said he desired to second the Motion so ably proposed by his hon. friend. He ventured to think that the Postmaster-General had adopted a wrong system. The right hon. Gentleman had the misfortune at the present moment to be the manager of a losing Department of the Government. There was a loss of £1,000,000 per annum on the telegraph system, and in the face of that important fact the Postmaster-General came to the House and asked the large sum of £6,000,000. When it was suggested in Committee that instead of getting the whole of that amount at one fell swoop, he should come to the House after £1,500,000 had been expended and ask for a further donation towards his scheme, he rejected the suggestion with scorn. A Government pledged to economy, and also to the retention of control by the House of Commons over the expenditure of the country, ought to have accepted the Amendment to give effect to that suggestion. No business man would adopt the system proposed by this Bill, and give to the manager of a losing concern *carte blanche* to do as he liked with £6,000,000, and to account to no one until four or five years had passed.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Harold Cox.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now,' stand part of the Question."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR regretted to hear that the Postmaster-General was prevented by illness from attending, and that he would probably not be able to be in his place for a fortnight. In the circumstances the debate would be taken under two inconveniences—one, that it would encroach on the time devoted to the Evicted Tenants Bill, and the other that the Postmaster-General could not be present to meet face to face the ingenious Gentleman who had attacked his measure from below the gangway. The Government were very anxious to get on with the Bill, not only in connection with their scheme of business, but on account of some need of money; but he should think that they must feel that they ought to postpone the discussion of this measure on both the grounds he had stated, and that they ought to be discussing other Bills. In these circumstances, he suggested to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in the temporary absence of the Leader of the House, whether it would not be desirable to postpone the debate for a fortnight, in the hope that the Postmaster-General would then be restored, as they all desired to see him restored, to his accustomed health. He begged to move that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.) said he had no departmental responsibility for this Bill and was not in a position to enter into its details. The Bill had been put down in the belief that it would be treated as a non-contentious measure and that there was something like a general agreement upon it. In fact it was put down as the first Order so that that day might not be counted as an allotted day for the Evicted Tenants Bill. Only the Patronage Secretary knew of the unfortunate illness of the Postmaster-General at the opening of the sitting. If the right hon. Gentleman persisted in his Motion—he was not speaking in any hostile sense—if the right hon. Gentleman thought that there was such a body of real, genuine criticism prepared to be made on this Bill, he must aquiesce; but the Bill could not be postponed for a fortnight, before which the Postmaster-General could not be present. In the course of a few days there would be some Minister capable of dealing with any question which might arise.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he had made no inquiry among his own friends as to whether there was any desire to discuss the Bill at length, but from speeches to which he had listened he thought there was some reason for the postponement of the debate.

Question put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 3:—

SIR F. BANBURY moved, on behalf of the hon. Member for South Antrim, to insert words to secure that before the compulsory acquisition of land for the purpose of the Act, the owner should have been offered the fair market value of his land, and should have refused to sell it to the Estates Commissioners. To him it seemed to be an extremely reasonable Amendment. The very first thing that the Estates Commissioners should do was to offer the fair market value to the owner of the land. He could not see that anyone would be hurt by such a proceeding, and he could not understand that the land should be taken compulsorily except at its fair market value. He would be glad to hear on what grounds that would be objected to by hon. Gentlemen sitting below the gangway.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 7, after the word 'purposes, to insert the words 'if, after having offered to the owner of such lands the fair market value thereof, he has refused to sell to the Commissioners and the Commissioners shall use such lands.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. BIRRELL said he quite agreed that the price to be offered to the owner of the land was its fair market value, and he was willing on Report stage to introduce words to make that clear. But he did not wish it to be for a moment in doubt that the question as to what was a fair market value was a question to be settled by the Estates Commissioners themselves. He would have no objection to some such words as, "After having offered to the persons appearing to be the owners of the land, such price as appeared to them to represent the fair market value of the land." They knew that many owners of the land had made no reply to offers made to them by the Estates Commissioners. He did not say that the Estates Commissioners were to be arbiters of what was the fair market value of the land, but they should be obliged to put something to the owners of the land as to what they thought was a fair market value.

SIR F. BANBURY said he would be very glad to accept the Amendment of the Chief Secretary. He might be allowed to call the attention of the hon. Member for Waterford to the fact that an English Member had had to intervene to get an Amendment accepted, which the right hon. Gentleman said was fair and reasonable.

MR. BIRRELL: So fair and reasonable as to be already in the Bill by implication.

SIR E. CARSON (Dublin University) asked if the proposed Amendment by the right hon. Gentleman to be inserted at the Report stage would also apply to the case of a tenant before he was compulsorily expropriated.

MR. BIRRELL said that they would come to that later on in the Bill.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said that perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would meet the difficulty by accepting the Amendment he had on the Paper, because it dealt with the case of both tenanted land and untenanted land.

MR. BIRRELL promised also to consider between then and the Report stage whether the tenant who would be expropriated should also come within the scope of the Amendment.

Mr. Birrell.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) apologised to the House for being too late to move his Amendment. Its object was simply to prevent the Estates Commissioners coming to a man and saying over his head, "We want so much of your land and we are going to take it." It only provided that there should be the ordinary time given for making amicable arrangements with the owner of the land in the first instance, and while he did not think the words suggested by the right hon. Gentleman were of much value, because under them they were to rely upon the Estates Commissioners to say what was the fair market value of the land, he would withdraw his Amendment, which was designed in order to try and find out whether the right hon. Gentleman did intend at some stage of the Bill to give them an appeal.

*THE CHAIRMAN said the hon. Member was out of order in discussing that question now.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG acquiesced, and repeated that, although he did not think there was very much value in the words suggested by the right hon. Gentleman, as he wished to offer no unnecessary opposition to the Bill, he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said the next Amendment was a drafting one which the right hon. Gentleman had accepted. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 8, to leave out the word 'may' and insert the word 'shall.'"—(*Mr. James Campbell.*)

Amendment agreed to.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (for Mr. MOORE, Armagh, Mid.) rose to move a proviso as follows: "Provided always that the total amount of land to be acquired under this Act shall not exceed 80,000 acres, and a separate record of all land so acquired shall be kept by the Commissioners and shall be available for inspection by any person or persons claiming to be aggrieved; (2) no land shall be acquired under this Act unless and until the owners shall have refused to accept a reasonable offer for its purchase by the Estates Commissioners, and the Estates Commissioners shall not be at liberty to refuse to declare tenanted lands an estate by reason of the fact that the owner has not agreed to sell an untenanted portion of his lands to the Commissioners." He said that the first part of the Amendment was based upon the Report of the Estates Commissioners, who set out that the amount of land required would be 80,000 acres, and while they on that side had expressed themselves as willing and as desiring that all deserving and respectable tenants in Ireland should be reinstated, they thought that some limit should be put upon the number of tenants and the amount of land to be taken for that purpose. They pressed that view particularly because of the fact that hon. Members below the gangway some few years ago were of opinion that if about 300 or 400 evicted tenants were reinstated, the whole question would be settled for ever. They found, however, from the Estates Commissioners' Report that 1,000 tenants had been already reinstated and 2,000 more were to be provided for under this Bill. They had also been told that the amount of land to be dealt with was to average forty acres per holding, and they therefore thought that some specific limit should be placed on the amount of land to be taken under this Bill. The second part of the Amendment practically embodied the idea contained in his own first Amendment.

*THE CHAIRMAN said the hon. Member had better move the first Amendment only at this stage.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG asked if he would be in order in moving the first part of the Amendment.

*THE CHAIRMAN said he thought it would be better for the hon. Member to move the first Amendment. When they came to the second Amendment he would rule upon it.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG moved the first part of the Amendment dealing with the total amount of land and the record.

Amendment proposed:—

"In page 1, line 9, after the word 'estate,' to insert the words, 'Provided always that the total amount of land to be acquired under this Act shall not exceed 80,000 acres, and a separate record of all land so acquired shall be kept by the Commissioners and shall be available for inspection by any person or persons claiming to be aggrieved.'"—(*Mr. Charles Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. BIRRELL did not think that any useful purpose would be served by accepting the Amendment. They had had careful inquiries made as to the probable amount of land required, and they had the assurance of responsible persons that 80,000 acres was the limit. The Commissioners had worked out that figure on their own responsibility. As to the suggestion that forty acres should be allotted to each tenant, he did not want any hard and fast rule in regard to that to be laid down. Sometimes forty acres might be sufficient but sometimes more than forty acres would be necessary. The Commissioners must look into the nature of the holding, neighbourhood, and the like. Therefore he did not think it desirable, and the Government could not consent, to insert a statutory limit of this kind. He thought the Committee should consider that 80,000 acres was the outside limit, but the Government were not prepared to insert it in the Bill as a statutory provision. The proposed record was not necessary, as obviously the land required would be known.

MR. WALTER LONG was sorry that the Chief Secretary had not seen his way to make some suggestion in regard to this Amendment. He could quite understand his unwillingness to accept it, but it only set out the estimate of the Estates Commissioners themselves. He understood that they said that 80,000 acres would be the outside amount, and for that reason it would be seen that this was not an unreasonable proposal to make. They had been told that the Bill had one object, the restoration of the evicted tenants. That being so, it was possible to arrive at a perfectly safe estimate which would give the Commissioners ample scope and at the same time make it clear that their power was not to be exercised under pressure that might afterwards arise in order to carry the operation further than Parliament intended. There had been a remarkable growth of evicted tenants between the time when the right hon. Member for Dover had to deal with the question and the time when he himself had to deal with it. In the first instance the number was put at some hundreds, and the hon. Member for East Mayo spoke of the number as 800. Now they had 8,000 applications, which had been gradually cut down to 2,000 after the examination of the Estates Commissioners. But anybody who had watched this movement knew that the number was increasing and the passing of this Bill was much more likely to add to the claims of those who said they were evicted tenants than to decrease them. There was a possibility of the 2,000 being doubled and trebled. He did not think that that was a result which ought to follow from the passing of this Bill. It might be reasonable to put the number of acres at 100,000 or not to define any acreage at all, but to deal with this matter at a subsequent stage of the Bill, and limit the number of evicted tenants to be reinstated. He submitted that some limitation was necessary either in the amount of land to be taken or in the number of tenants to be reinstated. For himself he would rather see a limitation of the number of tenants than a limitation of the acres to be devoted to the purpose, because, as the Chief Secretary had truly said, forty acres might be too little in one case and too much in another. Therefore it might be desirable to keep the number of acres as vague as possible, but he thought they ought to have some statement as to the number of evicted tenants. At all events they ought to have some statement of policy from the Government, because as the Bill now stood it could be used for the reinstatement of any number of people who might come within the description of evicted tenants. For these reasons he thought they ought to press the Amendment, which did not set up any limitation which the Government had not imposed upon themselves.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone) supported the Amendment, and said he felt very strongly that there should be some limitation either in the acreage or in the number of tenants. He appealed to the Chief Secretary to give them some idea as to the holdings which would be allotted to the evicted tenants. He thought it would be found that 80,000 acres of land would be found far more than was required to settle the tenants upon the land.

MR. BARRIE also expressed regret that the Chief Secretary had not seen his way to some limitation in one way or the other. Although the right hon. Gentleman said that this was the outside figure, hon. Members below the gangway had given no assurance that the Government had reached the full limit of their demands. Even if this concession were granted he ventured to think that the right hon. Gentleman would have further demands made upon him after the Bill had passed. It was in that spirit this Amendment was moved. He thought it reasonable, and that the Chief Secretary would be well advised to consider now whether some limitation could not be made.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said it was on untenanted land alone that anybody in Ireland could draw for extending uneconomic holdings, which had been recognised as the agricultural curse of that country. Suggestions had reached him that the amount of such land was limited. He believed this draft of 80,000 acres from the untenanted land would leave, he would not say a deficit, but very little margin for the real reform of the agrarian system. If the Chief Secretary had any estimate of the untenanted land available, he thought he ought to lay it before the Committee. Quality was also an important consideration. The amount of land of a kind on which tenants could be planted was the measure of the power of the Government to deal with the root agrarian difficulty in Ireland. If they were going to sacrifice the future of the tenants whose holdings needed enlarging to people who had not for many years been cultivators of the soil, he thought the Bill, instead of doing something substantial to settle the Irish land difficulty, would only increase it. The one thing the Government could not do was to increase the area of Ireland.

MR. BIRRELL recognised the importance of the question which the right hon. Gentleman had raised, and said he had referred to it more than once as one of the reasons why it had been found necessary to take compulsory powers under this Bill. He would endeavour to get the best estimate he could of the number of acres available, but they varied considerably in the various counties. In Roscommon and Galway there was not much difficulty, but in Mayo there was a great shortage of land of that description. It was true that they could not increase the size of Ireland, but he would remind the House that there was a Bill for improving waste land, and it was possible that something might be done with that proposal if money were forthcoming. There was a good deal of waste land in Ireland that might be reclaimed and made available for sustaining the population. He agreed with the right hon. Member for North Dublin that the important point was the number of tenants, because that was the factor that really determined the acreage required. The Bill did limit the number of persons. It defined evicted tenants as persons mentioned in the Act of 1903 who were evicted from their holdings before the passing of that Act, and who made application to the Estates Commissioners before the date named. It was not reasonable to assert that such a class was going to be enormously extended. He did not see why it should be extended at all; but he did not wish absolutely to close the door on a reconsideration of some of the cases that had been investigated on the spot by the inspectors and passed under review by the Estates Commissioners. He did not wish absolutely to say what was the number of tenants which constituted the determining factor. The time might come when they would know definitely who those people were, but he would not like to pledge himself at that moment to print a list of the persons who alone certainly and finally were to be treated as evicted tenants within the meaning of this clause. They had got very near to them, and would eventually get them actually; but at present all he could do was to ask the Committee to take 2,000 as the number not likely to be widely departed from. These claims could not be added to by more than a few. He thought the Committee would run no risk in leaving the matter as it stood in the Bill.

SIR E. CARSON said that in 1903 it was stated by hon. Members below the gangway that the number of evicted tenants was 800.

MR. BIRRELL: Without inquiry.

SIR E. CARSON said he doubted that very much. He thought the hon. Members below the gangway knew very well that they were talking about. An inquiry was held some years ago by a quasi-judicial tribunal which also fixed the number at a similar figure. Since 1903 they had increased from 800 to 8,000—a very fair rate of progress considering the population of Ireland. Although the right hon. Gentleman said that he only required land for 2,000, he found nothing in the Bill which limited the number. Not only was there no limitation in the Bill as regards the number, but there was none as regards cost. Supposing 2,000 tenants were absorbed, they could not put the amount of public credit to be pledged at less than £2,000,000; if there were 8,000, it would mean £8,000,000. There was not even a limit as to the amount of land an evicted tenant was to get. Did the Government suppose that a tenant turned out of 200 acres would be satisfied with 40 acres, or was one turned out of 10 acres to get 40? Was the man turned out of say 250 acres to be put on the same footing as the man who had been turned out of 10 acres? Not only was public credit to be pledged to this work, but there was to be no limit to the amount of land to be given to any individual tenant, nor was it shown that the quantity of land to be given was to bear any relation to what the tenant had held in the past. Surely a cruder or a wider measure was never put forward. The Estates Commissioners, who, he had no doubt, were the most admirable men in the world, were to have unlimited power to apply public credit for acquiring land for the purpose of reinstating evicted tenants. They might have put this Bill into two lines—"The Estates Commissioners shall have power to give as much land as they please at as much cost as they please, which the Treasury are quite willing to bear, to any evicted tenant in Ireland." That was really the whole of the Bill. There ought to be some indication of how the land was to be distributed by the Commissioners in fixing the amount of the land required.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange) pointed out that in the Act of 1903, for which the hon. and learned Gentleman was partly responsible, there was no limit. ["Compulsion."] Yes, "compulsion" was their constant cry in reply to every argument.

SIR E. CARSON said he would not have interrupted with the word "compulsion" save for the reason that where they had no compulsion they necessarily had no reason for a limit.

MR. CHERRY said the word "compulsion" came up in the minds of hon. Gentlemen opposite like King Charles's head; it cropped up in every argument. Compulsion was discussed on Wednesday last *ad nauseam*; there was then no restriction on anything that was then said, and there was no closure; they had exhausted themselves on the subject, and it was now time that they went to other important matters in the Bill. He had a word to say about the Amendment, but he need only to mention the Act of 1903 and they would immediately cry "Compulsion, compulsion." He admitted at once that there was no compulsion in the Act of 1903, but that measure gave an absolutely unlimited power to the Estates Commissioners to reinstate any evicted tenant in any amount of land at any time. ["No, no." AN HON. MEMBER: "And at any cost?"] Yes, there was no limit as to cost. He could have understood the right hon. and learned Gentleman saying, "You are allowing these three dreadful men, the Estates Commissioners, to spend £100,000,000 on an infinity of land in order to reinstate an unlimited number of tenants." One hundred millions might have been advanced under that Act; there was no limit; they had the power under the Act to buy and resell land for the reinstatement of the evicted tenants. On the other hand, by this Bill, in the first clause of it, as his right hon. friend had pointed out, the number of people was confined to those who were evicted before a certain date and who had made out a case to the Estates Commissioners. So far as compulsory powers were concerned they were distinctly limited in that way. In the Act of 1903 there was no such limitation. He believed that there was a great deal more risk under the voluntary arrangement of the Act of 1903 than under a compulsory arrangement, because the former was unlimited, while the latter was under some limitation. Under the voluntary system the landlord and tenant arranged between them, and the Commissioners had no voice in the matter, though they were supposed to be the custodians of the public money. Under this Bill, when they came to the restoration of the evicted tenants they had a body of three gentlemen who were appointed by the Government to discharge official duties, and it was their business to see that they paid a proper and reasonable price for the land, and that they resold it to the evicted tenant at a reasonable and proper price. But what hon. Gentlemen opposite really objected to was the blessed word "compulsion," a principle which the Government thought was necessary for the proper working of the measure.

MR. WYNDHAM (Dover) said he could not accept the description given by the right hon. and learned Member of the Act of 1903. He had described its sections in a way to suggest that the Commissioners could have spent £100,000,000 if they chose on the reinstatement of evicted tenants. That really was a travesty of the provisions of the Act. The evicted tenants were included among other classes, and they were given no priority and no preference, and, besides that, there was the limitation that the cost of any holding was not to exceed the capital value of £1,000. Where greater latitude was given to meet the case of a tenant who had had a larger holding than would be covered by the sum of £1,000, perhaps a farm of several hundreds of acres, it was expressly provided by the second section—

> "That such larger advance or sanction to any purchaser shall be without prejudice to the wants and circumstances of other persons residing in the neighbourhood."

So there they saw that the evicted tenants were only one class among many classes; they had no priority or preference, and the limit of £1,000 for a holding could not be exceeded save where it could be shown that it would be without damage or injury to persons living in the neighbourhood.

*MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) thought that the Chief Secretary had taken rather a rash view of the amount of untenanted land that would be available for the reinstatement of evicted tenants, and also for the purpose of increasing the size of uneconomic holdings in the west of Ireland. If the right hon. Gentleman looked at the debate on 29th October last year he would see that the then Chief Secretary, Mr. Bryce, made the very startling statement that in Ulster, Munster, and even in Connaught there was not more than one-third of the land which could be used for increasing the size of the uneconomic holdings. If that was the condition of things in Connaught surely it meant that they were going to take away the land which should have gone to increase the size of the uneconomic holdings, and give it to the evicted tenants, thus depriving those in the district of the land which should have gone to increase their holdings to economic size. As regarded the number of acres to be taken under this Bill he agreed that 80,000 acres was rather a small limit to impose. The number of applicants had been 8,400, and 6,100 had been inquired into, leaving 2,300 still to be adjudicated upon. If the right hon. Gentleman looked at page 6 of the Report he would see that the Commissioners had 1,600 cases to be provided for, because they had already been adjudicated upon, and besides that number they had 2,300 cases still to adjudicate upon. Of course he knew that the Report stated that it was thought that not more than 400 of these cases would, in the opinion of the Commissioners, pass the test; still, there might be some 3,500 or 3,600 evicted tenants to be provided for which would take 150,000 acres. He thought that such an Amendment as that under discussion ought to be included.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said the question they were discussing was a very important one if they desired to secure the successful administration of the Bill. The Chief Secretary had asked was it likely that he would ever yield to pressure to include in the category of tenants persons who did not properly come under that category. He would remind th eright hon. Gentleman that if the Bill became law in its present shape he would be quite helpless in the matter, because that power was being handed over to the Estates Commissioners. It was no answer to say that they should trust to the discretion of the Chief Secretary or his successor in office. The right hon. Gentleman had anticipated somewhat the discussion upon the Amendment standing in his (Mr. Campbell's) name, which dealt with the number of the evicted tenants, and at first he thought he was going to pronounce in favour of the limitation fixed in that Amendment. The Chief Secretary started with that contention, but he pulled himself up and gradually receded from the impression which he at first left upon those sitting in opposition. Surely some limitation was necessary. It had been stated on behalf of the Government that they objected to this Amendment because they did not wish to close the door against some of those tenants whose claims had already been rejected. The moment that statement became known in Ireland every one of those 8,500 evicted tenants would have their hopes revived. The right hon. Gentleman said the Estates Commissioners had informed him that there were some cases in reference to which they were desirous of hearing something more. Apparently there was to be no finality on this matter because, as regarded those 8,500 cases, it was understood that the Commissioners had once and for all ruled them all out except 2,000. Apparently they had been under a delusion in this matter; the door was to be left open.

MR. BIRRELL: What I said was that there were a few cases in regard to which the Estates Commissioners desired the door to be left open, but they were very few indeed.

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL asked if the names were going to be scheduled. If not all those rejected tenants would quite properly bring pressure to bear upon the Estates Commissioners in the hope that their case might be reconsidered. This point ought to be clearly stated in the Bill, so that those tenants would know that the time had gone by for any further or fresh agitation. He could not imagine anything more calculated to destroy any approach to finality in this matter than the two statements made by the Chief Secretary: (1) That he and the Estates Commissioners did not want to close the door against the men already rejected; and (2) That there were a certain number of those rejected men whom the Estates Commissioners had expressed a desire to hear more about. The fact that since 1903 the estimate as to the number of evicted tenants had gone up from 800 to 8,000 had not yet been explained. The Estates Commissioners said they had sifted those 8,500 cases down to 2,000, and the Chief Secretary said the Bill provided homes for 2,000 scheduled and named evicted tenants. If that was the case what objection could there be to stating in the Bill that the number of persons to be reinstated should not exceed 2,000? If the Bill was left in its present form the Estates Commissioners could deal with 8,500 tenants. Clause 2 laid it down that the Estates Commissioners might, decide who were fit and proper persons to be recognised as evicted tenants. Consequently they might throw everything to the wind that had been done already and start upon a fresh investigation. He thought the right hon. Gentleman would agree that in this respect his criticism was perfectly right and fair. The object of the clause was said to be to limit the discretion of the Commissioners, but it did not do so; it provided that they were to restore those tenants who, after the Bill became law, they might consider to be fit and proper persons, and they could give the go-by to what they had done already. They all knew the amount of pressure which could be brought to bear upon these matters in Ireland by clergymen, politicians, and local authorities, not merely to increase the number of tenants to be let in but also to put B in the place of A. He did not think the Estates Commissioners would be able to resist that pressure, and they ought to welcome the protection offered by this Amendment in order that they might say to the local authorities: "We are very sorry, but the time has gone by and we cannot do this now." Surely it would be sufficient if the Chief Secretary accepted an Amendment which would give him a little elasticity to cover the few isolated cases he had alluded to. In fairness to the Estates Commissioners and the evicted tenants some limit should be accepted. If a limit was not accepted he could assure the Committee that, as a result of what the right hon. Gentleman had said about his anxiety to keep the door open, and that the Estates Commissioners should consider a certain number of the rejected cases, the gates would be opened to a flood of pressure from every part of Ireland upon the Commissioners. The only way that could be prevented was by putting in a limitation either of age or number. If the right hon. Gentleman thought 2,000 too rigid a number, he would be willing to agree to such a reasonable limit as would enable the Estates Commissioners to provide for the few cases they were anxious to reconsider. Unless a limit was stated there would be a fresh agitation the moment the Bill passed more violent than any that had been brought about by previous measures.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 65; Noes, 265. (Division List No. 297.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)

Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Coates,E.Feetham(Lewisham)
Corbett,A.Cameron(Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hills, J. W.
Kimber, Sir Henry
King,Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col. A.R.
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Middlemore,JohnThrogmorton
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Roberts,S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Charles Craig and Mr. Ashley.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker,JosephA.(Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,SirJ.Williams(Devonp'rt
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brodie, H. C.
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Devlin, Joseph
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,MajorE.Martin (Walsall
Elibank, Master of
Essex,R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner,Col.Alan (Hereford,S.)
Gilhooly, James
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon,RtHn.SirW.Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M. (Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Hyde, Clarendon
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb,EdmundG. (Leominster)
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea,HughCecil(St.Pancras,E.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy(Essex,Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down,S.)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield,H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.

Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncaster
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt, Cecil William
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)

Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T. F. (Wolverhampt'n)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)

Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F, W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, N.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilso, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG moved an Amendment to provide that the Estates Commissioners should not be at liberty to refuse to declare tenanted lands an estate by reason of the fact that the owner had not agreed to sell an untenanted portion of his lands to the Commissioners. He said the object of the Amendment was to prevent the Estates Commissioners from being able to punish a landlord for not agreeing to sell an untenanted portion of his lands. There was quite enough of compulsion in the Bill already, and he thought the landlord should be safeguarded in the way he proposed.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 9, at end to insert the words: 'The Estates Commissioners shall not be at liberty to refuse to declare tenanted lands an estate by reason of the fact that the owner has not agreed to sell an untenanted portion of his lands to the Commissioners.'"—(*Mr. Charles Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*MR. ASHLEY supported the Amendment. He said that the Estate Commissioners had treated the owner of an estate whom he knew in such a way that the Amendment of his hon. friend was necessary. This man had made an agreement to sell his land at a certain price. The tenants were satisfied, the owner was satisfied, and everything was arranged. But the owner had a certain detached farm up in the mountains which the Estate Commissioners wished to purchase at a certain price for the purpose of extending uneconomic holdings. They and the landlord could not agree on the price. All that the latter asked for was that he should not be out of pocket in regard to the purchase money when that money was invested in trust securities as provided for in his settlements. The Estates Commissioners refused to give him that sufficient price, and said they would only give the owner one-third of what he had hitherto derived from the land, and that, unless he accepted that price, they would not put their seal to the sale of the remainder of the estate to his tenants.

MR. CHERRY said he did not know whether the attention of hon. Members had been drawn to the fact that the Government had already accepted an Amendment which rendered the Amendment now proposed entirely unnecessary. The word "shall" had been inserted instead of the word "may," so that in any case where the Estates Commissioners purchased any given area, that would be regarded as a separate estate, so as to enable the owner to get the bonus. The 10 per cent. bonus was to be paid originally in cases of voluntary sales, but the introduction of the word "shall" provided that in every case the bonus should be paid.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said that the object of the Amendment was to meet the case where a landlord had an ordinary estate of 1,000 acres which he wished to sell to the tenants, while desiring to retain in his own hands a certain amount of untenanted land. The Estates Commissioners, however, said that unless he sold the untenanted land they would not declare his property an estate. He knew of a case in the county of Meath. The landlord agreed to sell to the tenants on certain conditions, and the inspector of the Estates Commissioners appeared on the farm, and having inspected it stated to the bailiff and to the landlord who were present that there was plenty of security for the money to be advanced but that in any case the owner would have to sell to the Estates Commissioners at least 100 acres for evicted tenants. Now, the tenant and his predecessor had been in possession for 100 years, and not a single tenant had ever been evicted on the estate. There they had a case in point. An agreement for the sale of a large farm which both parties were willing to carry out, and the tenants did not even ask for the full rent from the Estates Commissioners. And yet the Estates Commissioners insisted that 100 acres out of an estate of 360 acres should be sold to them for the purpose of providing farms to evicted tenants in other parts of the country. That showed the necessity for some such Amendment, and he hoped that the Attorney-General would have something to say on the point, as the right hon. Gentleman did not seem to understand why the Amendment was moved.

MR. CHERRY thought that the Amendment was still more objectionable as explained by the hon. Member, because he was endeavouring to amend the Act of 1903 in an essential particular. That was clearly out of order. The discretion of the Estates Commissioners in the matter as described in that Act could not be amended in this Bill, which dealt only with evicted tenants, and they could not possibly dream of interfering with the discretion of the Commissioners as regarded the sale of land generally throughout Ireland.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.) said that this Bill would be an independent enactment of general application, and if the Amendment were passed, it would repeal one of the most fundamental provisions of the Act of 1903. He asked the Chairman whether the Amendment could be moved.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG submitted that the Amendment did no more than the Bill itself. The Bill amended the Act of 1903 in almost every clause, so far as it dealt with evicted tenants. It seemed to him a new doctrine that an Amendment to one Bill should be out of order because it amended something in an Act already passed.

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said that after the explanation of the right hon. and learned Member the Attorney-General it was quite obvious that the Amendment was out of order.

MR. J. F. MASON (Windsor) moved to insert at the end of the first subsection of Clause 1: "Provided that where any part of an estate is acquired compulsorily, it shall be lawful for the owner to require that the whole of the estate shall be so taken." He said that as the Bill now stood it was open to the Estates Commissioners to take a part of any estate on their own terms, and to plant down evicted tenants who were not necessarily connected with that particular estate but might come from any other part of Ireland, on conditions of purchase which were favourable to them. Under those circumstances, what would the position be? They would have on this particular part of the estate evicted tenants planted down who were paying less in interest on the purchase money than their neighbours would be paying for rent, even when the rents were fixed as fair rents. Again, no provision was made for the labourers on the holdings from which the tenants were removed to find them holdings, or compensation for being disturbed. The claims of these labourers were worthy of some consideration. What position could be more unsatisfactory than the existence of these two bodies of small proprietors and tenants living side by side under conditions so entirely different; what could be more certain to create dissatisfaction and to bring about disorder in the district? That was a strong reason why his Amendment should be considered. The Chief Secretary had said that the existing tenants were to be displaced because they were bad farmers, but surely it was unfair that bad farmers should be planted on another estate. All he proposed was that if they took one portion of a man's estate for the purposes of this Bill they should take the rest of the estate on the landlord's request for the purpose of carrying out the Act of 1903.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 9, at the end, to insert the words 'Provided that, where part of an estate is to be acquired compulsorily, it shall be lawful for the owner to require that the whole estate shall be so taken.'"—(*Mr. James Mason.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG desired to support the Amendment, which seemed to him to be eminently reasonable. If the Estates Commissioners came down to a landlord's estate and picked bits off here and there for the purpose of providing for evicted tenants, say to the extent of one-third of the estate, he thought it would be admitted that it was not an unreasonable provision that the landlord should have the right to compel the Estates Commissioners to take the whole of it. The effect of his hon. friend's Amendment might be limited if necessary. He admitted that if in the case of a large estate the Commissioners secured one very small piece or corner, the landlord should not be able to make the Commissioners buy the whole of say 10,000 acres. But the converse case was just as likely to happen. If, on a small estate of 200 acres, the Estates Commissioners required 30, 40, or 50 acres for the purposes of or this Act, surely it was a reasonable thing that a landlord who had lost the best part of his estate and had had outsiders thrust upon him should be able to compel the Commissioners to take the whole of his small estate off his hands.

Mr. CHERRY thought the hon. Member for Windsor did not really understand the effect of his Amendment, which would be objectionable. The primary object of the Bill was to provide land for evicted tenants, and the compulsory powers only applied to the acquisition of untenanted land or land which was in the occupation of new tenants. The Amendment sought to compel the Estates Commissioners to purchase from an owner who had any untenanted land for sale his tenanted land as well. If it were accepted, it would oblige them to determine the tenancies of the tenanted land and turn out the tenants. The Government had been vigorously attacked for going as far as they had, but this Amendment would compel them to go much further than they had ever contemplated. They could not accept the Amendment.

Mr. WALTER LONG said the Attorney-General for Ireland had remarked that his hon. friend the Member for Windsor did not know what the meaning of his own Amendment was, but for his own part he did not think the right hon. Gentleman himself had gathered the purpose of it. He thought the language of the Amendment was perhaps unfortunate, especially with regard to the words "so taken" at the end of it, but it was easy to alter phraseology so as to prevent its going further than the promoter of the Amendment intended. His hon. friend's suggestion was that, where the Estates Commissioners descended upon the estate of a landlord who had not evicted his tenants, in order to provide holdings for the evicted tenants from another estate, if the owner desired that his property should be sold as a whole he should have a prior right to the general sale powers of the Act of

1903. He looked at this matter, not from the point of view of the landlord alone or from that of the tenant alone, but also from the point of view of general policy. The object of the Government was to remove possible sources of disturbance. Did they really think that their policy of planting down on an estate, where the majority of tenants would be rent-paying tenants, a new body of men who would be sitting on better terms and more agreeable conditions, would have the pacifying effect they desired it should have? He quite agreed that they could not enforce a right to purchase where thirty or forty acres were taken out of a large estate, and that there ought to be some limitation. But in a great many cases it would not be a small bit of land, and the amount would probably be sufficient to make a mark on the estate itself. Unless some safeguard were inserted, he was convinced fresh difficulties would arise which would either need further legislation or cause delay in giving prompt and practical effect to the Act of 1903. He did not think the Attorney-General for Ireland should dismiss the Amendment and say in effect that it was *ultra vires*, and unworthy of consideration.

MR. CHERRY: I said it was objectionable.

MR. WALTER LONG said that no doubt the principle *de minimis non curat lex* might be applied to the Amendment, or it might be said to be impossible. Those were solid arguments, but where a man had land taken from him in order to deal with difficulties on estates other than his own, he thought he ought to receive more consideration. The arguments he had mentioned did not fall, however, from the right hon. Gentleman, and he regretted that he felt compelled to deal with the matter in such a summary manner. He regretted the absence from the House of the Chief Secretary, though he understood and appreciated the reason for it, for he regarded the question as one of serious importance.

MR. CLANCY said the Amendment came from the English sympathisers with the Irish landlords, and was about the most amusing illustration that he had seen of the pure humbug that had gone on throughout this Bill. A short time before they were discussing the limitation of the provision in regard to the purchase of 80,000 acres.

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said the hon. Member must confine himself in his remarks to the Amendment.

MR. CLANCY said he only wished to point out the humbug of this Amendment, which would enlarge the scope of the Bill.

MR. T. L. CORBETT asked if it was in order to describe as humbug an Amendment which the Chairman had allowed to be moved.

MR. CLANCY said they had listened to a set of arguments destined to show that undue pressure would be put on the executive and unlimited discretion given to the Estates Commissioners, yet here was an Amendment which proposed to extend the powers. As an illustration let them take the estate of the Marquess of Clanricarde, which was 65,000 acres. It was suggested that if ten acres was purchased for the purpose of reinstating an evicted tenant Lord Clanricarde should be able to compel the Estates Commissioners to purchase 64,990 in addition. If that was to be allowed on all the estates in Ireland 2,000,000 acres might have to be bought up. He ventured to say, after hearing all the arguments which had been adduced against such a thing by the Party of which the hon. Member was a member, the present Amendment was humbug and nothing else.

MR. CHERRY said the right hon. Member for South Dublin had placed an entirely different interpretation upon the Amendment from that which the language clearly conveyed. It provided that if the Estates Commissioners sought to acquire any land compulsorily the owners of that land should have power to compel them to take the whole of the estate. The right hon. Gentleman had put an entirely different construction upon it. His interpretation was that if the Estates Commissioners compulsorily acquired a portion of an estate they should allow the landlord voluntarily to sell the whole to the tenants. There was nothing to prevent a voluntary sale now, and it was not necessary to put such a proviso in the Bill. Then the right hon. Gentleman had said he wanted the owner to get some priority for the sale of the rest of the land if some was taken compulsorily. But he (Mr. Cherry) thought that the hon. Gentleman meant what he said in his Amendment, namely, that if there was to be compulsory sale of one portion of an estate there should be compulsory sale of the whole. The Bill only dealt with provision of land for evicted tenants, and therefore the adoption of the Amendment would be very extraordinary. He appealed to the mover to withdraw it.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL hoped the Amendment would not be withdrawn. It simply gave to a landlord the power given at present in the case of a railway company requiring land, namely, where a portion of the land was taken to insist upon their taking the whole, on the ground that what was left was of no value to him. In the case of the Marquess of Clanricarde's estate, there might be a thousand agricultural tenants—rent-paying tenants who had not bought under the Land Purchase Act of 1903. But the Estates Commissioners would no doubt pick out certain portions for evicted tenants, and it was possible there would be ten persons not tenants like the rest of the people, but paying about 4s. an acre, while the rent-paying tenants would be paying 8s. That would convert the estate into a sort of magpie, and probably these 8s. tenants would become centres of disturbance in the district, and cause discontent among the rest of the tenants. What the Amendment proposed to do was to say that in such cases as that the landlord should be entitled to say, "If you are going to take a part of my land you must take the whole of it." If those who were responsible for this Bill had any instinct of justice they would at once say that that was a just demand. Why should a landlord be asked to sell his estate in a piecemeal manner; why if one part of the land was taken, should not the landlord be able to say that the remainder was of no use to him and that they must take the whole or none? That was what the Amendment asked, and was it not justice? If the Chief Secretary had been in his place he thought that he would have understood this proposal. He must confess that from his speech he did not think that the Attorney-General for Ireland did understand the Amendment.

MR. CHERRY said he was not dealing with the Amendment on the Paper, but with the interpretation which had been given of it by the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said he thought it was a matter of ordinary good taste and good sense to deal with the Amendment on the Paper in the sense in which it was put forward by its mover.

MR. CHERRY said it was as a matter of courtesy that he had dealt with the point raised by the right hon. Gentleman in his speech. He might have been out of order in doing so, probably was, but it was only as a matter of courtesy that he had dealt with the interpretation which the right hon. Gentleman had given of the Amendment.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman had exhausted himself in the matter of explanations; he had been given four opportunities of explaining, and he had left the matter exactly where it was. He was glad to see that the Chief Secretary was now in his place, and he trusted that they would have the advantage of his intelligence, which he knew to be very great, on this question. What he was endeavouring to point out was that a landlord might have a rent-paying tenantry, but if for the purposes of this Bill land was acquired on his estate for reinstating evicted tenants, he would have dotted over his estate a number of persons who would necessarily become centres of disaffection and disorder amongst the rent-paying tenants, who might feel that their position was less advantageous than that of the reinstated tenants, and the condition of the property might be made very burdensome and very troublesome. What he suggested was that they should apply the remedy that was applied under the Lands Clauses Acts in the case of compulsory purchase for a public purpose: if a portion of a man's property were taken and it interfered with his enjoyment and comfort in the use of the rest of it, then he had a right to serve notice calling upon the promoting company to take the balance of the land. The object of the Amendment before the House was to enable an owner to say to the Estates Commissioners that what they were leaving him was so uncomfortable that he would rather get rid of the whole of it, and, if they were not prepared to take the whole of it, then they would not get any of it. That was, he thought, a reasonable and just proposal, and he had very great pleasure in supporting it.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) said that if ever there was justification of the Motion of the Prime Minister it was to be found in the painful exhibition of the last half-hour. In an irrelevant and incoherent speech the extraordinary doctrine had been laid down by the right hon. and learned Gentleman, in support of this absurd Amendment, that if a field were taken for a railway under the Lands Clauses Act, the owner might require that the promoters of the railway or any other undertaking should take not merely the field but the whole estate. He had in his mind the case of an estate where a railway ran through fields, and stretching from the side of that railway were about three miles of estate; yet the hon. and learned Gentleman told them that the owner of that estate could have objected, and required the promoters to take the whole of the property. And that was the sort of argument which was addressed to the Committee, supported by wearisome and tedious iteration. The time of the Committee was wasted in this frivolous, vexatious, and paltry manner. Here they had a proposal to take a small quantity of land for a great public purpose, in pursuance of a great compact between the Tory Party and themselves, and ratified by Parliament, and then they had this Amendment which proposed that if the Commissioners required 100 acres of land for the purpose of restoring evicted tenants the landlord was to have the power to require that the Commissioners should take the whole of his land or none. Yet on the same side of the House, among members near the right hon. and learned Gentleman, they had heard the criticism only a short time before that for the whole of Ireland not more than 80,000 acres were to be taken. And this was called serious debate! It was trifling with the time and patience of the Committee. It was trifling with the intelligence of the country, and its character was reflected in the paltry and dwindling minorities which they saw in the divisions. These hon. Members represented a class who tried to put obstacles in the way of tenants who had done no wrong except to pay them too much rent in the past. He thought that it was time that their proceedings were so regulated as to prevent tedious repetition and continued irrelevance. He repeated that if anything justified the Motion of the Prime Minister it was the painful exhibition which they had just witnessed.

MR. BARRIE said the hon. Member for North Cork had complained of the want of lucidity in the speech of the Member for the University of Dublin. He thought he might very well pass the same criticism in regard to the speech of the hon. Member. The Amendment before the Committee provided that where part of an estate was to be acquired compulsorily, it should be lawful for the owner to require that the whole estate should be taken. That was not an Amendment which ought to give rise to any want of sincerity. It was hardly less important than any other Amendment which had been put down. Let the Committee consider what was likely to happen in a fairly large estate such as were met with in South Tyrone, where tenants paid rents and were delighted to have the opportunity of paying. In South Tyrone, as in North Londonderry, evicted tenants were so very scarce that he was sure they would look with interest upon one when he was unearthed.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR IRELAND (Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.): There are 282 evicted tenants in South Tyrone—more than there were in some of the southern counties.

MR. BARRIE, continuing, said that out of the 8,500 listed even 282 was not a very large number. But he regretted that even that number should be manufactured.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is not addressing himself to the Amendment, which confines the discussion to very narrow limits.

MR. BARRIE stated that the number of evicted tenants in his constituency only amounted to twenty-five, and only five of those had been able to impose upon the Estates Commissioners. So far as the proposal in the Bill was concerned the division he had the honour to represent objected to it *in toto*. He supported the Amendment because he felt that the exercise of such a large and unheard-of discretion as was proposed to be given to the Estates Commissioners to impose a certain small class of evicted tenants upon a large estate where there were peaceful and contented tenants, would not only create discontent among the tenants but depreciate the property of those tenants as well as the property of the landlord. It could not be contested that what were now termed evicted tenants were from the point of view of agriculturists detrimentals—men who had not succeeded in their business. It was because he represented those who had succeeded and desired to succeed by honest and straightforward means, that he had pleasure in supporting the Amendment.

SIR E. CARSON pointed out that in the case of placing one tenant on an estate the cost of the investigation of title would be as great for that one holding as for the whole estate. That would be a very great hardship upon the owner or upon the tenant. That was another reason why it should be considered whether the Estates Commissioners should have power to place a few tenants on an estate without buying the whole.

MR. BIRRELL said he had put an Amendment on the Paper to make the point perfectly clear. He quite agreed that the landlord ought not to be made to bear the cost of compulsory purchase. If they took the man's land compulsorily they ought to bear the costs of inquiring into the title. He held very strong opinions as to the absurd amount of the costs that were involved in the investigations of title, under the whole of the Irish Land Acts, and he hoped means might be found of facilitating and accelerating the process and reducing the enormous mountain of costs which had been incurred without in any way affecting a single question as to the right of the landlord to sell. To acquire a whole estate because 30 acres of land were wanted to reinstate a tenant would increase enormously the amount of land required, and he was unable to accept the Amendment; but as regarded the costs, that question would arise hereafter, and he would himself propose an Amendment to deal with that question.

MR. J. F. MASON agreed that it would be unreasonable if a small portion of land were required, that his Amendment should operate in an absurd manner. He thought, however, that there would be no difficulty in amending it in such a way as to provide that if more than a certain proportion of the estate was taken the landlord should have power to require that the whole estate should be bought. It would be generally acknowledged that to go into a tailor's shop and buy compulsorily a pair of trousers and a coat and leave the waistcoat would be unjust. He thought some provision was necessary to meet this point.

MR. T. L. CORBETT appealed to the hon. Member for South Tyrone, who used to be a great advocate of compulsory purchase, and who had denounced the evicted tenants in round terms, to state whether he was prepared to allow the principle of compulsion to be generally applied and thus permit honest men to come by their own as well as the evicted tenants on behalf of whom alone the Government now proposed to act.

SIR F. BANBURY said that as he understood the Amendment it proposed that if part of an estate were taken against the wishes of the owner he should be in a position to insist that the whole of the estate should be taken. He admitted that if only 30 acres were required on an estate containing 10,000 acres it would be awkward for the Estates Commissioners to have to take over the whole. At the same time one had to look at the fairness of the Bill to the landlord. Let them consider what the effect would be if three holdings amounting to about 90 acres were taken from an estate of 10,000 acres. In that case three tenants might be reinstated. These tenants would be undeserving people. [Cries of "Oh."] Well, that was his opinion. They had either not paid their rents, in which case they were not fit people to be put into farms, or they were able to pay and did not choose to do it. What would be the effect on the other tenants on an estate of the reinstatement of an evicted tenant? They would probably refuse to pay their rents in the hope that they would be put in a nice farm somewhere else with the help of money provided by the State. One must not forget that human nature being what it was, if they said to people: "If you repudiate your lawful obligations, or if you are unfortunate enough not to be able to carry them out, the State will find the money to put you in another farm," there would be a great temptation to a number of people to follow that advice. That was why the Commissioners ought to take over the whole estate and become responsible for all the tenants. If the Amendment were carried, there would, no doubt, be considerable trouble to the Estates Commissioners, but it was trouble which they ought to take upon their own shoulders. He denied that it was for the public advantage that the evicted tenants should be reinstated. It was for the advantage of a particular class.

MR. BIRRELL said the hon. Baronet opposed the Act of 1903, and therefore was more entitled than some hon. Members to argue as he had. It was perfectly well understood that under that Act the evicted tenants should be restored.

SIR F. BANBURY said it did not restore them by compulsion. He opposed that Act because, having studied the Irish question for a considerable number of years in the House, he had come to the conclusion that the more they gave to hon. Gentlemen below the gangway and to the Irish tenants, the more they wanted. He was not so green, to use a colloquial expression, as many hon. Members, and he agreed with the late Lord Salisbury that all they could do was to administer the law in a resolute manner.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL said the difficulty in this matter arose in two ways. He would take the case of a landlord who evicted a tenant, say fifteen years ago, and was himself in possession of the land. There were 600 such cases in Ireland. At the Land Conference the landlords said with a certain degree of fairness—he admitted that the argument was not all on one side—that they declined to take back the evicted tenants, because they were on bad terms with them, and because these men had given a lot of trouble. Very well, it was proposed to put them back, not as tenants, but as purchasers. That was a wholly different thing. That broke the relationship between the landlord and the evicted tenant. If the landlord took up the ground—and it was a possible ground to take—that these men who were restored to their holdings would demoralise the whole estate, then the remedy for that was perfectly clear. The landlord could sell the estate under the Act of 1903. That answered the question of title.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL: For what price would he sell it?

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL said the right hon. and learned Gentleman knew the answer. It was simply this—if the landlord thought it a breach of the compact to take these men back because they would demoralise his estate, he could sell the whole estate under the Act of 1903.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL indicated dissent.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL said the right hon. and learned Gentleman shook his head, but he knew as well as any living man that one of his colleagues cleared out of his estate in County Antrim with thirty years purchase. The second point was that because the Estates Commissioners desired a certain amount of untenanted land, they would have power to take it compulsorily for the purpose of reinstating the evicted tenants. That was the power which this Bill would give. The mover of the Amendment had contended that if the Estates Commissioners took compulsorily 100 acres of a 5,000-acre estate, they should be forced to take the whole estate compulsorily, although they did not want it. That proposal could be left to the judgment of the Committee. It was one which even the most determined opponents of the Bill could not stand to, and the Government could not accept it. The purchase of land compulsorily, for which the Commissioners had no use, was advocated by hon. Members who earlier in the debate had declaimed against compulsion altogether. Every honest land reformer went as far without compulsion as sensible men were prepared to go with reason, and that was the length to which he himself went. The difference between himself and hon. Gentlemen opposite was that he promised to vote for compulsion, and did it while they promised to vote for it, and voted against it.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG said the hon. Member for South Tyrone ought not to have made the statement that his hon. friend the Member for North Armagh got thirty years purchase for his land.

*Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: I qualify the statement by saying that the Report of the Estates Commissioners shows that he received twenty-seven years purchase and three years bonus.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG said his hon. friend gave to his tenants over and above very considerable rights of turbary.

*Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: I know that bog.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG said that if the Estates Commissioners compulsorily took possession of the best parts of an estate for the purpose of reinstating the evicted tenants the landlord would have the balance thrown on his hands. The hon. Member for South Tyrone knew perfectly well that the Act of 1903 provided for the Estates Commissioners purchasing the whole of an estate from a landlord for the purpose of re-selling to the tenants. That being so, where was the hardship in this case if the landlord asked that they should purchase the whole of an estate when they proposed to purchase a portion of it? It was reasonable that a landlord should be able to say to the Estates Commissioners that they should take the whole of an estate off his hands.

Colonel KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) said that the hon. Member for South Tyrone had laid before the House the most extraordinary proposition he had ever heard. The hon. Member kept his eye fixed on only one side of the proposition and argued that little or no hardship would be inflicted on the owner of a property by its compulsory evisceration for the purposes of this Bill. He contended that there would be such hardship. The hon. Member did not enter into the feelings of owners of property, but he would be a much fairer-minded legislator and a much better law-giver if he would occasionally try to understand the feelings of those on whom he constantly wished to trample. If he could understand the feeling of ownership of property, the deep regard the owners had for the discharge of their duty, and the enjoyment of their rights and privileges, the owners would have more chance of fair play being meted out to them. To say that the owner was not injured was an absurdity.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): Who injured Horne?

*The CHAIRMAN: I really must protest against that old story being resuscitated.

Colonel KENYON-SLANEY: I assure you, Mr. Emmott, that, although you protest against it, I do not, and if the hon. Member goes down to the country where I am known, and asks that question, I only hope I shall be at hand to protect him from the horse-trough. And I can assure the hon. Member there is no one whom I would rescue with greater pleasure. Continuing, the right hon. Gentleman said that it must surely be admitted that by the compulsory division of an estate, the capital or selling value of the property was considerably lowered. He appealed to the Chief Secretary, who was getting so bored with his own Bill to try the experiment of acquiring a nice property in Ireland, and having a bit of it completely taken away compulsorily. He thought the result would be that the right hon. Gentleman would very soon sever his connection with Ireland, and that he would not get the same price for his property as he gave for it. The capital value of the property must be decreased. It was a great mistake of hon. Gentlemen opposite to assume that the selling value of an estate was based solely and absolutely on the rental value. It was based also on the amenity which surrounded the estate, on the satisfaction it gave to the owner, on all the links and associations which went to make up what in this country was called the homeland—he did not know what it was called in Ireland—by the ties of long connection, and long descent. When they came compulsorily to extract from the estate 100 acres here and another 100 acres there, they could not but make the owner of the rest of the property dissatisfied. Those who said that that would not lower the value of the land differed from every auctioneer or land agent engaged in letting land in the country. If by their action they inflicted a loss upon an innocent man, they themselves ought to stand the loss, and should not play the double game of first carrying out a political move, and then casting the loss they inflicted upon somebody else's shoulders. If a transaction of that sort were brought before some of the Judges, epithets might be applied to it which would be decidedly unpleasant. He could not see why landed property should be dealt with in a manner which broke all the canons of fair play. He believed that the argument of the hon. Member for South Tyrone had entirely broken down. If it were said that the Government wanted to carry this measure to a successful issue, that was the common purpose of all the House. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh, oh!"] Yes, they all recognised that the reinstatement of the evicted tenants would make for the contentment of the people of Ireland as a whole. He never recognised the full force of the grievance of the evicted tenant. To him the evicted tenant was a man who was evicted for dishonesty. He did not represent martyrdom or anything which justified exceptional treatment; but while not pressing his opinion on this point, he begged those on both sides of the House who wanted to make this measure efficacious, and who did not desire to heal one wound by creating another, to endeavour to be fair to the other interests involved, and not to make a contented tenantry by making a discontented ownership.

Question put—

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 76; Noes, 284. (Division List No. 298.)

AYES.

Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchest'r
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Wor)
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Gov'n
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gretton, John
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Ed'm'ds
Hills, J. W.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)

Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Lord Balcarres.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davis, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Devlin, Joseph
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Wals'll
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Rt. Hn. Sir W Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Hortaio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Donc'st'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.

O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'th'mpton)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mp'n
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim S.
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E.
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walters, John Tudor
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

MR. CLANCY moved to amend subsection (a) by omitting the words limiting the compulsory acquisition of parcels of land for those evicted tenants, "who, or whose predecessors, were evicted from their holdings before the passing of the Act of 1903." He explained that the Act of 1903 enabled tenants evicted since the year 1878 to be restored to holdings provided for them by the Commissioners, and inasmuch as there had been no change in the law, a man who was evicted since the Act of 1903 was enabled to be restored, because he had been evicted since 1878. He believed it was actually the fact that among the 2,000, roughly speaking, whom the Estates Commissioners thought were proper persons to be restored, were included a certain number of the tenants evicted since the Act of 1903. This Amendment simply sought to extend the provision of the compulsory acquisition of land to those cases. He did not think the Government should make a distinction between the two classes of tenants. There must be many deserving cases among those who were evicted since 1903, and as a matter of fact there was not an Irish representative in the House who did not know of one such case, and he did not think that if the whole were included, it would not add more than 200 to the 2,000.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 14, to leave out from '1903' to the word 'who,' in line 16."—(*Mr. Clancy.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out down to the word 'before' in line 16, stand part of the clause."

MR. BIRRELL said that, although he was prepared to agree with the hon. Member that the number of evicted tenants would not be materially increased, he found it to be impossible to accept the Amendment, having regard to the answers he had already given to Amendments moved from the benches opposite. The Government must confine themselves in this matter as far as they could to what he had called the Parliamentary bargain, and when they were taking for the first time compulsory powers to reinstate the evicted tenants they must confine the power to those tenants who were evicted before the Act of 1903. By confining the Bill in this way they were in a position to hold out to the House, the country, and the Treasury, the necessary and final limitations as to the number of persons in whose aid the Exchequer was being invoked. The Government had therefore inserted this limitation in the subsection, and he thought they must adhere to it.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND said he was sorry the right hon. Gentleman did not feel able to make this small concession. The right hon. Gentleman had not given any answer to the point made by his hon. friend. He pointed out that amongst those 2,000 cases, to which the right hon. Gentleman had so often alluded, and which had been investigated by the Estates Commissioners and decided as fit and proper cases for reinstatement, there were a certain number in which eviction took place after 1903, and if that were so, he did not see how the right hon. Gentleman was justified in saying to the Commissioners that these few cases should be excluded. The right hon. Gentleman would be perfectly consistent in accepting the Amendment. If he found that among these 2,000 there were a certain number evicted since 1903 he would be perfectly justified in extending compulsory powers to them. It would be very hard if they were excluded from this Bill. They all knew of some of these cases that had arisen since 1903, and they knew that they had arisen because of the action of the landlords in refusing to sell and refusing to carry out the provisions of the Act of 1903. There had been a few hard cases. They were included in the 2,000, and he really could not understand why the right hon. Gentleman struck at this small matter now. He earnestly asked the right hon. Gentleman to consider it. To refuse the Amendment would be deliberately to leave outside the Bill some of the very hardest cases that had occurred for years past.

Mr. WALTER LONG said the right hon. Gentleman had refused other Amendments to limit the Act, and he thought his attitude was consistent with regard to this one. The Chief Secretary rested his position on what he was pleased to call the bargain of 1903. He ventured to suggest that when he took a foundation for his case the right hon. Gentleman should see that it was on rock rather than on sand. As had been more than once pointed out the Chief Secretary's interpretation of the Parliamentary bargain was not that of the Opposition, nor was it that of the hon. and learned Member for Waterford. And they now knew what was to be the pressure to be brought to bear. The hon. and learned Gentleman had said that this was a very small matter and meant a very small addition to the number to be included. It only showed the dangerous ground they were treading when they departed from what the Chief Secretary called a bargain, though, from the interpretation which the Chief Secretary and others had given to it, it had almost ceased to be a bargain. They did not know the number of tenants, nor the class of tenants to be admitted. If the Chief Secretary had given them the information they had asked for on that side of the House, and told them the number who were to be turned out, they would then have been on level terms with hon. Members below the gangway, and have known what was exactly the position with regard to this Amendment. They were told that there were certain cases which were included in the 2,000. Could not they have information which would be available to both sides of the House, telling them exactly what the facts were in regard to the cases before the Commissioners. It was quite clear from the two speeches which they had heard that these extra cases would be pressed, and that everyone would say that his own case was a particularly hard one and ought to be added to those already included by the Commissioners. He did not regret the decision at which the Chief Secretary had arrived; on the contrary, he thought that he was bound in the general interests of the community to keep within certain limits. He regretted the foundation, however, on which the right hon. Gentleman based his position, because in the first place it was not the Parliamentary bargain, and, in the second place, it was now found out that the limitations which he had imposed were limitations which would never be maintained.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG said the bargain made in 1903 was that the taxpayers of Great Britain should pay £100,000,000 to settle the land purchase question under the Act of that year, so that the tenants might become the owners of the farms, and at the same time it was agreed by all parties that the evicted tenants, who at that time were estimated by hon. Gentlemen below the gangway to be about 600 in number, were to be reinstated or provided with new farms. The persons who were to be allowed to avail themselves of this principle were those who had been evicted from their farms practically up to the date of the passing of the Act of 1903. They all firmly believed that that was to be a settlement of the whole question. The first breach of that pledge was made by the Chief Secretary in introducing this Bill, and the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Dublin County was a still more glaring breach of that pledge. Now it was proposed that persons claiming to be evicted tenants should bring pressure to bear on the Chief Secretary to be included in the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman by refusing to alter the list of 2,000 tenants who had been accepted by the Commissioners practically admitted that great pressure would be put upon them, and the Amendment was the first evidence of the pressure that undoubtedly would be brought to bear in order to have a larger class included than the 2,000. Of course, they knew that the Chief Secretary had said, though reluctantly, that he was against the Amendment. Why on earth should they go on for ever reinstating tenants who, apart from politics altogether, required to be sent back to their farms? If the right hon. Gentleman knew more about Ireland than he did he would know that he could not set a worse precedent than to hold out to improvident farmers, men who had neglected their holdings, who were behind in the battle of life because of their own shortcomings, that they would be restored to their holdings; and, to judge from the reluctance with which he had given up this Amendment, they had only to bring sufficient pressure to bear, they had only to cry out loudly enough, to be introduced to all the advantages of the Bill. If they had known that the evicted tenants clause was going to be used in the way it was being used many of them certainly would have considered the matter very differently. He was sorry that they had not realised at the time that they were going to reinstate not only evicted tenants for political reasons, but also the very much larger and as he thought very much less deserving, class of persons who lost their farms from a hundred causes that had nothing to do with politics, and which held out very few reasons for indulgence in that respect. He was glad, however, that the Chief Secretary had resisted this Amendment, and he only intervened in order to show what was going to happen. He ventured to prophesy that hon. Members, when they had been a few more years in the House, and especially if a Radical Government was in power, would see another batch of more or less undeserving tenants seeking to come under this Bill after it had become an Act.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.) said he regretted the decision at which the Chief Secretary had arrived. He knew that there were persons recommended by the Commissioners, but it must be remembered that there had been evictions since 1903. Why should not the Commissioners have a discretion in these cases? All oppression and harshness on the part of certain landlords did not cease after the passing of the Act of 1903; on the contrary some landlords had become more oppressive and harsh than before. He instanced the case where the tenants had been given a reduction upon their first term rent. If the landlord of an adjoining estate refused to sell the object of Parliament would be defeated, because that particular landlord refused to accept the same terms as his neighbours. Consequently that landlord's tenants, being unable to get the reduction which adjoining tenants had got under the Act of 1903, would suffer, and some of them would be unable to meet their obligations and would be evicted. Was it not very unfair to say that because a landlord was stubborn and would not sell at the average price such tenants should not be entitled to restoration in case the land had been sold? The right hon. Gentleman was now interfering with the carrying out of the report upon which the Bill was based. If some of the 2,000 tenants were excluded the Treasury would be the gainers, and he could not see that there would be any grievance from a financial point of view if the Amendment were accepted.

With regard to the sanctity of the bargain of 1903, it was violated by the landlords of Ireland almost the day after it came into operation, because they refused in the majority of cases even to allow the inspectors of the Estates Commissioners to go on to the evicted tenants' land. The Amendment referred to only a few cases, but there was a question of principle involved, and he did not think that tenants ought to be left out in the cold because landlords had been unreasonable.

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL said the debate on the Amendment had been interesting in that it had disclosed the fact that hon. Members below the gangway had information as to the names of those 2,000 lucky persons who had received the sanction of the Estates Commissioners. The hon. and learned Member for North Dublin and the hon. Member who had just sat down had both said that they knew of cases where tenants had been evicted since the Act of 1903. Evidently hon. Members below the gangway had information which was not available to the rest of the House and which had been consistently refused.

Mr. O'SHEE said that he knew one case, because he had seen a letter from one of the inspectors to an evicted tenant.

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL said that the hon. Member for North Dublin had also spoken of facts within his own knowledge.

Mr. CLANCY said that what he meant to say was that among the 2,000 tenants he understood that there were several of the persons to whom he had referred.

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL said that even that amount of information had been denied to the House, and he had no means of obtaining it.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: We are in touch with the evicted tenants.

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL said that the imagined the information came from sources much nearer at hand. The Chief Secretary must see the necessity of giving the information to the House. He was not aware that the hon. and learned Member for Waterford had ever been in direct touch with the evicted tenants.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND said he was sorry to say that he had been present at hundreds of evictions.

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL said that unless the right hon. Gentleman limited in some way the application of this process he would be creating considerable trouble in the future for himself and his successors. It had been said that this was a small matter because the application of the clause would be limited. That was exactly what the hon. and learned Member for Waterford said in 1903. He said then it concerned only about 800 tenants. They now knew that the number had gone up to 8,000. The hon. and learned Member said that if the Amendment were accepted it would apply to only 100 cases. If the 100 multiplied in the same manner as the 800 in 1903, the proposal now made would involve 1,000 cases. He hoped he Chief Secretary would adhere to the rather faint-hearted decision which he seemed to have arrived at in refusing to accept the Amendment.

Question put.

The CHAIRMAN: The "Noes" have it.

Mr. LONSDALE rose to move the Amendment next on the Paper, but

The CHAIRMAN, intervening, said he had made a mistake, and must put the Question again.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: As a matter of fact our Amendment has been carried. I submit that as the Amendment has been declared carried there is no power in the Chairman to go back on the decision of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I gave the decision quite by mistake. I will put the Question again.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: On the point of Order, I respectfully say that there is no precedent for such procedure. You put the Question perfectly distinctly and we understood how the Question was put. I presume that every other body understood it. It is not our fault if a few hon. Members did not understand it. The matter has really been decided by the voices of the House. We called "No" when the Question was put; there was no cry of "Aye"; and you, according to the voices, declared that the "Noes" had it. Surely that decision must stand?

MR. BIRRELL: I certainly intended to adhere most firmly to the decision which I had arrived at, and I can only say that that will be the decision of the Government. That question will hereafter arise. Therefore, it should not for a moment be supposed that the Government waive their opposition to the Amendment. I had intended to say a word in reply to the right hon. and learned Gentleman, but I did not, perhaps foolishly. I can assure the Committee that it is the fixed intention of the Government to reject the Amendment, and if it were now allowed to stand the mistake would be corrected at a subsequent stage.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Of course the Government may take any action they like on the Report stage; but I submit that the decision of the Chairman must stand until the Report stage.

*THE CHAIRMAN: On reconsideration I find that the hon. and learned Member for Waterford is quite right; I only heard the "Noes," and I have given the decision for the "Noes." That must stand until the Report stage. Members voting to the contrary should make their voices heard.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Amendment was so unexpectedly carried, that I am not quite sure whether there are words consequential on the Amendment which should be omitted. It would be a great convenience to the Committee if you will tell us how we stand.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The position is that the words referred to in the Amendment are taken out. The other question I have to put is that the remaining words "before the passing of the said Act, and," should also go.

MR. WALTER LONG: I submit that if the first part of the Amendment is declared carried, then the remaining words cannot be put.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I was wrong in my first impression. The omission of these words carried as a consequence the omission of the other words.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): I am reluctant to rise on this point of order, but it is essential that we should get a clearer understanding. The Question you put was that the words down to "before," stand part of the clause. The remaining words have not been dealt with.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I have explained that the remaining words go consequentially.

LORD R. CECIL said that that had not been decided by the House. He contended that the remaining words must be put and dealt with.

*THE CHAIRMAN said he had decided that the Amendment carried the omission of the remaining words.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he quite understood that if certain words were omitted they might carry with them other words as a matter of grammatical construction; but he suggested that it was not the duty of the Chairman to excise words from the Bill without putting the Question to the Committee.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that the right hon. Gentleman was not correct. The position had been rightly stated by the right hon. Member for South Dublin. The words were left out on account of the previous decision of the Committee.

MR. CONDON (Tipperary, E.) moved to leave out the words "May, nineteen hundred and seven," and to insert the words "January, nineteen hundred and eight." He believed that this alteration would have no ulterior effect on the Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 18, to leave out the words 'May, nineteen hundred and seven,' and to insert the words 'January, nineteen hundred and eight.'"—(*Mr. Condon.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. BIRRELL said he could not accept the Amendment practically for the same reason which he had already given; and he hoped his hon. friends would make their voices heard in his support on this occasion, and adhere to the conditions laid down in the Bill.

MR. WALTER LONG said he could assure the right hon. Gentleman that he sympathised with him, and that the Opposition would do their best to help him. The right hon. Gentleman had been so long accustomed to inarticulate support in the House from his supporters in order that they might give more effective support to him in the Lobby.

MR. BIRRELL said the right hon. Gentleman should speak for himself.

MR. WALTER LONG said they were landed constantly in a different position from that in which they now found themselves. If all the right hon. Gentleman wanted was articulate support the Opposition would give it to him.

MR. O'SHEE said that he believed that the landlords on many estates from which the tenants had been evicted had not been disposed to sell their estates, on the assumption that under the Act of 1903 the evicted tenants could not be restored unless the landlord agreed. The tenants had given up hope that the landlords would agree, and that was the reason why in many cases the tenants did not send in their applications at all, or not in time.

Amendment negatived.

And, it being Eleven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

SHERIFF COURTS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Read a second time, and committed to a Standing Committee.

ADJOURNMENT.

On the Question that the House be now adjourned,

*MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) said he desired to call attention to a matter of some importance. It was with reference to the protection of the Fleet. In common with some other Members of the House he had had the privilege of visiting the Fleet recently, and had learned a great deal, and had been much impressed with what he saw. He had asked a great many questions—among them, if it so happened that that night a foreign torpedo boat came up to the anchorage of the Fleet, what was there to prevent it discharging torpedoes and blowing up the battleships? Were there any vessels of any sort, such as picket boats, for the defence of the Fleet? The answer he got was that there was no protection, but that it was exceedingly improbable that such an attack should be made in time of peace. They knew that no competent general of land forces would do otherwise than protect those forces by means of sentinels. They knew that Port Arthur was attacked by surprise by the Japanese, and that we did the same thing at Elsinore. So long as we spent £30,000,000 per annum in maintaining a Fleet, it should not go to bed every night without a proper guard. People might say that we would have notice before an attack was made upon the Fleet, but his contention was that in time of peace such precautions should be taken as would allow of the Navy being always protected. No foe who desired to attack us would give notice of his intention. If the Government said that it was not necessary to have a Navy at all he would go into the division lobby and support them, but as long as we had a Navy it should be protected against any unforeseen attack. He did not however think that any nation desired to attack us.

Adjourned at Thirteen minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 23rd July, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.

Report from, that the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the London County Council (General Powers) Bill ought to be dispensed with, and the Bill allowed to proceed, subject to the restoration of the definition of a "Tenement House" to the form in which it was inserted in the Bill as introduced into Parliament. Read, and agreed to.

Local Government Board (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill. Reported, without Amendment, and recommitted to a Committee of the Whole House tomorrow.

Ashton-under-Lyne, Stalybridge, and Dukinfield (District) Waterworks Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered and agreed to.

Sunderland Corporation Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments; and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Alton Military Hospital Bill [H.L.], Electric Supply Corporation Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Sheffield Corporation Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

London and North Western Railway Bill, Penrith Urban District Council Bill, Worthing Gas Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Aberdeen Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [H.L]. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill. Committed: The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection in regard to the Chelmsford Order.

Local Government Provisional Orders No. (13) Bill. Committed: The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection in regard to the Norwich Order.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill. Brought from the Commons, and read 1ª; to be printed, and referred to the Examiners. (No. 133.)

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 15) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill.

Moved, That the order made on the 20th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 18th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2ª.——(*Lord Allendale.*)

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (The Earl of ONSLOW): My Lords, there are a large number of Bills in respect of which the Standing Order is proposed to be dispensed with; but I have been in communication with the Local Government Board and I think there is good reason why your Lordships should agree to this Motion.

LORD AVEBURY: My Lords, the Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill raises some questions as regards audit, and although I have no objection to anything which is in the Bill, I beg to give notice that when we reach the next stage I shall ask your Lordships to consider whether it would not be an advantage to introduce into this Bill, and, if so, into others afterwards, the provisions unanimously agreed upon by the Joint Committee of the two Houses which sat under the presidency of the noble Earl the Lord President of the Council.

On Question, Motion agreed to, and Bills read 2ª accordingly.

PETITION.

ADVERTISEMENTS REGULATION BILL.

Petition for amendment of; of Fulham Borough Council; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TREATY SERIES, No. 21 (1907).

Accession of the Commonwealth of Australia to the Industrial Property Convention of 1883, as modified by the Additional Act of 1900, 5th August, 1907.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Regulations applicable to schools for blind, deaf, defective, and epileptic children.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACTS AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.].

Report from the Select Committee (with the Proceedings of the Committee) made, and to be printed. (No. 130.): Bill reported with amendments, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next; and to be printed as amended. (No. 131.): Minutes of Evidence laid upon the Table, and to be delivered out.

MUNICIPAL REPRESENTATION BILL [H.L.].

Report from the Select Committee (with the Proceedings of the Committee) made, and to be printed. (No. 132.): Bill reported without amendment, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House. Minutes of Evidence, with an Appendix, laid upon the Table, and to be delivered out.

STANDING COMMITTEE.

Report from the Committee of Selection for the Standing Committee that they have added the Lord Granard (E. Granard) to the Standing Committee. Read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

IMPORTED WATCH-CASES BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee without amendment, and to be read 3ª on Thursday next.

QUALIFICATION OF WOMEN (COUNTY AND BOROUGH COUNCILS) BILL [H.L.].

Read 3ª (according to Order) and passed, and sent to the Commons.

COMPANIES (CONSOLIDATION) BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF **GRANARD**: My Lords, since the Companies Act of 1862 there have been no fewer than seventeen amending Acts, and the object of this Bill is simply to codify and arrange all these different statutes. There is at present before the other House the Companies Bill of this session which I had the honour of introducing in your Lordships' House, and we intend holding over this Bill, if your Lordships grant it a Second Reading, until that measure has passed the other House, in order that we may be able to add to this Consolidation Bill the Amendments effected in the Bill now before the House of Commons. With these few words I trust your Lordships will give the Bill a Second Reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª (according to Order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

ADVERTISEMENTS REGULATION BILL.

Bill read 3ª (according to Order).

LORD **KILLANIN** moved the insertion of a new clause, after Clause 7, providing that it should be the duty of every metropolitan borough council to enforce within its own area any by-laws made by the London County Council under paragraph (1) of Section 2. He had moved an Amendment in Committee to a similar effect but more extensive in its application, and the noble Earl who represented the Home Office was unable to accept it. He understood that since then there had been communications in the matter, and that the noble Earl would be able, on behalf of the Home Office, to accept the new clause now proposed.

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 7, to insert the following new clause: 'It shall be the duty of every metropolitan borough council to enforce within its own area any by-laws made by the London

County Council under paragraph (1) of Section 2 of this Act, and any expenses incurred by a metropolitan borough council in the execution of this provision shall be defrayed as part of the expenses of that council.' "—(*Lord Killanin.*)

EARL BEAUCHAMP: My Lords, the Home Office see no objection to the Amendment in this form.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH, speaking on behalf of the promoters of the Bill, said that after what had passed he would offer no objections to the incorporation of this Amendment. His object during the passage of the Bill had been to be very careful not to take sides in any conflicting opinion which might exist as between the London County Council and the metropolitan borough councils will regard to the subsequent enforcement of the Act. The promoters of the Bill thought that these were matters which ought to be decided on the authority of the Government Department concerned, and, as the Home Office thought this Amendment represented the right course that should be taken, they gladly agreed to it.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES BILL.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*The Earl of Portsmouth.*)

THE EARL OF WEMYSS: My Lords, before this Bill passes I wish to say a few words in order to make my own position with regard to it clear. This Bill is a revolution. It tears up by the roots our existing military system, and it is wholly inconsistent with the Resolution which was unanimously passed by your Lordships' House in 1904—

> "That any scheme of Army reorganisation which does away with the Militia Force is contrary to sound policy, destroying as it does the ancient constitutional foundation of our military system."

No doubt it may be said that, in consequence of the arrangement made in the other House, the Militia has been retained; but while it has been retained in name, its whole constitution has been changed. At present it is a force which can volunteer to go overseas, but under the Bill it will be a force which may be ordered to any part of the world. Therefore, I hold that your Lordships have acted inconsistently with the Resolution I have just read, and which was passed unanimously by both sides of the House.

But it is not so much to this as to my own position that I wish to refer. I have taken a very keen interest in the Militia Force, and have thought it wise that it should be retained as originally desired. I have, nevertheless, avoided all participation in the discussion on this Bill. This is my first appearance since the Bill came up to your Lordships' House. I knew that this great change was about to be made, and that my single voice raised against it would not have been of the slightest use. Therefore, I have abstained from coming here until to-night, and I propose not to make a speech, but to read a protest which I desire to have entered upon the Journals of the House, and I hope that other noble Lords will be willing to add their names to my dissent. I will read the document, which states that I protest against the passing of the so-called Army Reorganisation Bill for the following reasons—

> "Because it destroys the foundations upon which our military system has rested from all time.
>
> "Because that system was admirably suited to our insular position alike as regards home defence and service over sea, resting as it did on (1) voluntary service in the Regular Army for service alike in this country and over sea; (2) compulsory service in the Militia for home defence; (3) voluntary service in the Yeomanry and Volunteers for those who desired to escape the chances of compulsory service in the Militia under the Militia Ballot Act, which was an alleviation of universal compulsory service for home defence.
>
> "Because by the system of compulsory service in the Militia the competition for voluntary recruits with the Regular Army was taken away.
>
> "Because the Militia thus compulsorily raised for home defence was free to volunteer for service over sea.
>
> "Because it has in the past done admirable voluntary service with the Regular Army in our foreign wars.
>
> "Because this one, up to the present time, existing military system has been approved alike by all statesmen and soldiers.
>
> "Because it is only required to be put in force to render our country absolutely immune from foreign invasion, and in the state aimed at by the Resolution of the House of Lords, passed unanimously on July 16th, 1905—'that in the opinion of this House it would be a danger to

the Realm, and limit the power of the Navy as an offensive force in war to trust to it alone for home defence, and inasmuch as it is admitted that the Navy cannot guarantee us against so-called hostile raids it is the more needful that our land defences should be at all times such that no nation would ever attempt in any form a hostile landing on our shores.'

"Because in the place of our existing military system, by which these results could at once and without extra cost be obtained, we are to have a Militia Force liable to compulsory service over sea, thus doing away with the power of compulsion through the Militia Ballot which can never be applied to a force thus subject to compulsory over-sea service; while the Yeomanry and Volunteers are to be made liable for four years service in a so-called Territorial Force, from which continuous service they can only escape on payment of £5—their present term of service requiring only fourteen days notice.

"Because the training to which this Territorial so-called Force is to be subject can in no way fit it to meet the picked foreign troops with which an invasion of this country might in future be attempted with every prospect of success, supposing the Navy to be unable to protect our shores, a possibility foreseen by the Lords in the Resolution already quoted.

"Because in this Army 'reorganisation' scheme the so-called Territorial Force rests on no other foundation than 'hope, speculation, and optimism,' the words applied to it by the present Secretary of State for War.

"Because as shown in the acompanying paper, we could at once, without one penny additional cost, by a moderate application of the Militia Ballot have 1,250,000 troops for home defence, exclusive of Regulars; whereas, after deducting all those in the Territorial Force under twenty years of age and the men necessary for the garrisoning of Ireland, the Channel Islands, and our naval stations, there would only remain 50,000 insufficiently-trained men for the defence of Great Britain."

For these reasons I enter my protest against this Army Bill, the passing of which in its present form is due to the action of the late as well as of the present Government.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, my noble and gallant friend Lord Wemyss—I might refer to him as "my gallant friend" in more senses than one—has informed your Lordships that he desires to clear his conscience by recording on the Journals of the House the dissent which he has just read to your Lordships. I, too, desire to say a few words on the Motion that the Bill be read a third time, not with the object of protesting against the Bill, but to make clear to the House the manner in which I and some of my friends regard the measure.

One observation I hope I may be allowed to make without fear of contradiction, and that is that noble Lords opposite have certainly no reason to complain of the manner in which this Bill has been treated in your Lordships' House. It has met, no doubt, with a considerable amount of criticism, but that criticism has been entirely of a reasonable description, and it has proceeded almost entirely from noble Lords who have a right to claim that they speak on this subject as experts. It has been criticism, not of a merely destructive character, but criticism full of useful and valuable suggestion. The result has been that we now have in our hands a much better Bill than that which came in the first instance before your Lordships.

But I hope I shall not be understood as suggesting that we on this side of the House regard the Bill as by any means a perfect measure. All we can say is that it is a great outline. It is an outline which to my mind presents some attractive features, but it is full of immense gaps, upon the filling up of which depends entirely the ultimate value of the Bill. The first of these gaps seems to me to be that which has reference to the numbers of the Territorial Army to be created under the Bill. The Territorial Army is, after all the main feature of the Bill. We have failed altogether to obtain any precise information as to the total numbers of the Territorial Army. The matter really stands where it did when my noble friend Lord Newton referred to it the other evening, when he complained that we were not even told within half a million what the strength of the Territorial Army was to be. We are equally left in the dark as to the strength of that portion of the Territorial Army which will be I will not say a mobile force, because the noble Lord opposite objects to that expression, but which will be available when the obligatory points have been occupied in different parts of the United Kingdom.

Another point on which we are left very much in the dark is the cost which this Bill will entail upon the country. My noble friend Lord Midleton, in the debate on the Second Reading, pointed out that the apparent saving—a saving, remember, not to be arrived at at once, but after a considerable lapse of time—would probably not exceed somewhere about £800,000. I do not think that figure has been challenged. Against that we have to set the enormous expense which cannot fail to be involved by the setting up all over the country of these new County Associations, which have been well described as miniature War Offices, and which it will be impossible to run except at very considerable cost to the country.

At another point we are inevitably very much in the dark. Will the terms which His Majesty's Government are going to offer under this Bill to the Militia, to the Yeomanry, and to the Volunteers be a sufficient inducement to obtain the men whom we want in order to supply these forces? That, after all, is a matter almost entirely of conjecture. The anticipations of His Majesty's Government, as my noble friend said a moment ago, are to a great extent based upon hope, speculation, and optimism.

We must also remember that, whatever accession of strength may be derived by the passing of this Bill, it will be obtained at the cost of a great, and to the minds of many of us a dangerous, weakening of the Regular Army. As to that there can be no controversy. It has not been disputed that a number of fighting units have disappeared in order to make room for this Bill, and we have never yet been able to get to the bottom of what I may call the mystery of the Regular Artillery. The explanations we have received upon that point have been confusing and difficult to follow. It will, moreover, I think, scarcely be contradicted that, as a result of this diminution in the strength of the Regular Army, there will be a diminution in the number of the Army Reserve upon which we have to a great extent depended to bring about the efficiency of our fighting line.

It is, I conceive, our duty to point out these matters. We have certainly not stood in the way of this Bill or denied those in charge of it facilities for carrying it through Parliament. But it is necessary that we should make it quite clear that the responsibility for it rests upon the shoulders of noble Lords opposite, and not upon our shoulders on this side of the House.

I think it only due to noble Lords opposite that I should say that if the passage of this Bill has taken place without much heat or friction, if the discussions have been of a conciliatory and instructive character, if the result has been, upon the whole, to give us a better Bill, that has been due in great measure to the considerate attitude of the Minister who is the author of this Bill, and has had charge of it in the House of Commons. The suggestions that have been made from this side have without exception been examined in a thorough and considerate manner—they have not been hastily put aside—and I think we may claim that both in the case of the Militia and in the case of the Yeomanry changes have been made which render this Bill far more acceptable than it was at first to the members of those forces.

I dwell with pleasure upon this circumstance, because I think it due to His Majesty's Government that I should do so, and also because the attitude of His Majesty's Government in this case seems to me to be of happy omen for the future. During the few weeks of the session which remain several other Bills of a very difficult and controversial nature are likely to be brought before us. It is impossible that those Bills should be satisfactorily dealt with unless our criticisms of them are received in the same considerate and tolerant spirit as that in which our criticisms of this Bill have been received, and in resuming my place I desire to express my hope that when these other measures come before us we shall find noble Lords opposite not less ready than they have been in the case of this Bill to listen to our arguments and to deal fairly with them.

*LORD HAVERSHAM: My Lords, I should not have ventured to detain your Lordships even for a moment upon the finance of this Bill had not the noble Marquess again repeated what I cannot but think the extraordinary fallacies under which he labours in regard to the expenses of the County Associations. Since the Second Reading of this Bill I have had several interviews with those in the financial department at the War Office, and I could show your Lordships the exact items upon which the County Associations will have to incur expenditure. On Wednesday last, the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition assured your Lordships that the expenditure under these associations would be enormous. He said—

> "He was bound to add that the more the position and duties of these County Associations were considered the more evident it became that the expenditure which their operations would necessitate would be an enormous expenditure."

The noble Marquess has virtually repeated the same expression to-day. I hold in my hand Command Paper No. 3370, in which it is explained exactly what the County Associations will have to spend. I may observe that all expenditure upon the troops during the time that they are in camp is removed altogether from the County Associations; the money will be paid direct to the general officer commanding. There are four headings under which the associations' requirements are to be presented to the War Office. The first is establishment grants, and that is met by the £75 per company of which we have heard a great deal during these discussions, and which I would remind noble Lords would amount in a ten company battalion to £750 a year. Out of that it is true there will be the new expenditure on the secretary and the headquarters, but it does not include repairs to headquarters; and it is generally assumed that two rooms will be hired either in the town hall or at the headquarters of the corps, which would accommodate them sufficiently. Then there are the ordinary expenses of these rooms, such as fuel, lighting, and cleaning, and there are certain expenses for prizes and small items of that kind. There is also what is called the care and maintenance of ranges, but everything connected with ranges, except merely the upkeep of them, will be provided for under another head. The County Associations will have nothing to do but to find a caretaker; all the large expenditure, if any, in the hiring of ranges will be defrayed entirely by the War Office, and will not be found from these sums at all. Neither will structural repairs to the drill hall or headquarters be defrayed out of this fund. Then there is the question of stationery, but it is probable that the Stationery Office will supply that direct. Again, the Associations will not be out of pocket in regard to the capitation grants. The capitation grants will be given to cover two suits of clothing, at the rate of 22s. 6d. per man, to last three years, or 67s. per head. This is the average cost. As to the travelling grant, the amount will probably be a penny per mile for men going to the ranges, and will be paid by issue of routes. Lastly, there are the payments for drill hall accommodation and rifle ranges, but this includes only the actual rent or repairs; it does not mean structural repairs. The actual rent will be ascertained from the corps and will be paid in one lump sum from the amount taken in the Votes. If there is any question of excessive expenditure, such as the obtaining of a new range, that would be made a special requisition and would not be included in the annual Budget. This proves, I think, that it is impossible for the expenditure of the County Associations to run into a great amount. In fact, the whole of the expenditure does not go through the associations at all. To say, therefore, that there will be gross expenditure on the part of the Associations is exceedingly misleading, and there is no reason to fear that the cost of these associations will militate against the success of the Bill.

THE EARL OF MOUNT-EDGCUMBE: My Lords, I desire to say a few words at this stage. I should like to inquire of the noble Earl the Under-Secretary whether it is possible under the Bill for the County Associations not to be formed, or, at least, not to be formed universally. These associations were originally designed to deal with a homogeneous body of Volunteers, Yeomanry, and Militia, forming together the Territorial Force; but all that has been changed, and the force will now be composed exclusively of Volunteers. It is very difficult to see what the associations can do for the Volunteers that is not done under the present system.

Of course, the Bill does a good deal besides for the Volunteers. It introduces great changes which may be of considerable advantage, but on which I am not competent to form an opinion. A new system of training is introduced, but these things are quite independent of the County Associations. This new training system may be excellent and may produce a great improvement in the efficiency of the Territorial Force, but the County Associations will have nothing to do with it. The men are in future to be enlisted instead of enrolled, which may some day lead to their being paid. That is another matter which makes a great change, but which has nothing whatever to do with the County Associations.

The points with which the County Associations may be called upon to deal by the Army Council are enumerated in the various paragraphs of Clause 2. The first is the organisation of the units. I do not quite understand that. The units are organised now. The Volunteers are organised in companies, in battalions, and in brigades, according to the resources of the localities in which the units are maintained and according to a system which has been developed under the supervision of the War Office during the last forty years. The next point is the recruiting for the Territorial Force, and there, again, I cannot see how we can hope that the recruiting will be more strenuous or more successfully encouraged by a body of gentlemen forming a central committee in a locality than by the officers directly connected with the centres in which the units are raised. It is not like recruiting for any other Force. The men can only be recruited in the place in which they live, and if the interest of a particular locality is not sufficient to maintain a unit in that place I do not think it at all likely that any influence brought to bear by a County Association will add a single man to the muster roll. I think that is the opinion of the officers of the Force.

The next point is of great importance —it is the provision and maintenance of rifle ranges and buildings, including magazines and armouries. These are provided already, and I do not see what is to be gained by transferring the responsibilities of property in these things from the commanding officer to a central association, unless, indeed, the Volunteer officers desire it themselves, and I have not been able to find out that they do. It is not as if the County Associations were going to give them any pecuniary help. They cannot levy rates. The members are not going to be personally liable. All the money that is given to them must come, under the sanction of the Treasury, through the War Office and by direction of the Army Council, and I can quite understand that the Army Council may desire a source of local information to guide them as to the needs of the different units. I think, however, that such source might be very well supplied by a small committee, or, better still, by one man—by such a person as the Secretary whom it is proposed to appoint under this Bill. The other points referred to seem to me to be dealt with very well at present by the County Volunteer Rifle Association, which in my county has lately taken to encouraging rifle clubs, boys' brigades, and so on, and by the Soldiers' and Sailors' Help Society and by the Soldiers' and Sailors' Families Association.

What I desire to know is whether it is supposed to be absolutely necessary that these associations should be established in every county. Clause 9 says that no man can be enlisted for a county for which an association has not been established under this Act. Therefore, if there is a county in which no association has been formed you would not there apparently be able to enlist men. I have ventured to give notice of an Amendment to make it read that every man shall be enlisted in such county as he may select, the words being the same as are used in the rest of the clause with regard to his appointment to a particular unit. Then Clause 8 would be inconsistent. It vests the right to recommend for first commissions in the president. If there is no association formed there will, I suppose, be no president, and this right would then, so far as I can judge, be vested in nobody. The clause is a curious one both in form and in substance. No mention is made in the clause that this duty has vested in the Lord-Lieutenant from time immemorial in regard to the Auxiliary Forces generally, and with regard to the Volunteers ever since the Force came into existence. I think it is usual, when a change of that kind is made, to refer to the existing state of things which has to be changed. That, however, is not a matter of great importance. What the Bill does is to transfer from the Lord-Lieutenant a duty which he has performed up to the present time, and to vest it, not in a popularly elected officer, which might be in accordance with the spirit of the age, but purely and simply in a nominee of the

Army Council; and this duty is the only duty assigned by the Bill to the president of the association. No other duties are defined, nor is anybody empowered to define them in any scheme.

We may be told that the nominee will *prima facie* be the Lord-Lieutenant, but that does not affect the principle or the practical consequence. Suppose a Lord-Lieutenant shrinks from undertaking the responsibility which he may incur by accepting the post as president of the association. I do not mean official duties, because, as I have said, they are *nil*, for the only duty which is assigned to him is this particular duty which he is performing at the present moment. Or suppose he is declared incompetent by the Army Council. I do not know what noble Lords who hold the position of Lord-Lieutenant would feel, but if they were so declared incompetent to perform the duty which they are performing at this moment I should be surprised if any of them continued to hold the office, and in that way the Army Council would have practically the power to dismiss the Lord-Lieutenant.

But suppose the other alternative, that he declines to accept the office and another person is appointed. On the demise of the Lord-Lieutenant a younger man, able, willing, and competent to do the work, is appointed as his successor. Should we then expect that the Army Council would cashier their nominee for the purpose of putting in the new Lord-Lieutenant? I think that shows that this clause is, at any rate, one which ought to be considered. My only desire is to express the hope that the Government regard the appointment of these associations as permissive, and that they will not consider that because they have been talked about so much they are bound to be appointed in every county, but will see from experience how they work in one or two. I share the fear of the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition, that these associations will cause considerable unnecessary expenditure of money which might be far better used in other ways in promoting the improvement of the Territorial Forces.

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: My Lords, the noble Lord opposite who followed the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition took him to task, and I have no doubt intended also to take us to task, for complaints as to absolute ignorance of the financial intentions of His Majesty's Government under this Bill. He called attention to a Paper which has been on the Table of your Lordships' House for some considerable time, and practically suggested that if your Lordships had carefully studied this Paper you would have had no ground whatever for complaint on this head.

I should like to remind your Lordships what this Paper is. It is a statement showing the proposed financial control over the expenditure connected with the Territorial Forces. It shows how the financial control is to be maintained, but it says nothing whatever about the effects of this Bill on the Estimates, or of the changes which were introduced in the scheme in Committee in another place and in your Lordships' House. Part of this document is dated 15th April and part 17th May, so that it was, of course, written before the changes which were made in the Bill in your Lordships' House could possibly have been taken into consideration; while the appendix, which doubtless should teach us everything we want to know, is almost entirely blank. This is the document that we are told we ought to have digested.

The noble Lord gave us a few details—the 1d. per mile travelling allowance, and so on; but he gave no totals. Our ignorance on that point is not due to our not having asked for information. We have asked for information all this year, and, indeed, all last year, and we have been told absolutely nothing. I therefore think that it is rather hard that thus late in the day we should be reproached for being ignorant when we have been diligent, if not importunate, students for two years.

What broadly, are, our financial fears? They come under two heads. First of all we know that there is to be a grant of £75 per company to the County associations for the business of these miniature War Offices up and down the country; but we do not believe that £75 per company is going to be enough, and no attempt has been made to prove that that sum will be sufficient. We have asked, and hon. friends in another place have asked, for the production of a model scheme, but our request has been refused time and again. I was rather surprised at one remark which Lord Haversham made. He refused to take the cost of stationery into account, because, he said, the Stationery Office were going to provide it, and therefore it would not come into the Army Estimates. But the nation is going to pay for it. It is to be juggled out of the Army Estimates and saddled on to the Stationery Office Vote in order that His Majesty's Government may be able to show, either a saving, or not such a large increase as a result of their policy. The very fact that this suggestion has been made is proof of the slipshod financial methods that have been pursued in this connection from the very first.

Our first fear, as I have said, is that this £75 is not going to be sufficient. Secondly, we feel that if the Government are really in earnest, and are going to make the Territorial Army efficient in the new organisation into brigades and divisions, you will have to spend very much more on the Volunteers and Yeomanry than you do at present. As far as we have been able to ascertain, no calculation whatever has been made as to what will be necessary under this head. I understand the Secretary of State to have said, in reply to a question on the subject in another place on almost the last day of last session, that he was not so foolish as to make any prophecy as to what the financial result was going to be. Possibly Mr. Haldane was wise, from the Parliamentary point of view, not to make any prophecy, but it illustrates the fact that this is a financial leap in the dark. If it is necessary to spend more money in order to make the Territorial Army efficient, where is that money coming from? What will be the temptation? Will not the pressure of their followers be brought to bear on His Majesty's Government, as it has been brought to bear in regard to other matters, to reduce the Regular Army in order to provide the extra money required for keeping the Territorial Army up to a state of efficiency? That is my second fear, and I desire to protest against the possibility of that eventuality.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of ELGIN): My Lords, I do not propose to enter into any detail in regard to the criticisms of this Bill which have been made at this stage, because I think it was quite clear, from the speech of the noble Marquess opposite, that it would not be expected that we should now re-enter into the discussions which took place in Committee. But with regard to the observations made by the noble Earl who has just sat down, and by others, as to the finance of the Bill, I would just say this, that it seems to me that the money which is to be provided by Parliament is, under Clause 3 of the Bill, strictly regulated. The associations have in each case to submit their estimates, which have to be approved by the Army Council, and it is on those estimates and those approvals that the money is to be expended. In these circumstances, for all those services which are to be provided from moneys voted by Parliament, it does appear to me that the Bill supplies the essential part of the scheme under which this organisation is to work. There is provision in the Bill that the associations should also receive money outside that voted by Parliament; but it is laid down that that money may be expended on any of the purposes of the regulations. But in regard to that part of the expenditure involved in the regulations of the Army Council, there can be no doubt that the associations have a right to look, and will look, to the provision which will be made from the Votes.

I venture to think that in connection with the whole of this subject there has been some tendency to overlook the fact that the Bill which we are now passing is only the first stage in a certain process. The first clause of this Bill provides for the preparation of schemes, and there has been much criticism of the particular provisions laid down for incorporation in those schemes. But those provisions are not exhaustive; all that is provided is that they shall be included in every such scheme. That is entirely consistent with leaving a certain amount of discretion in the preparation of schemes in order to meet the varying circumstances of different parts of the country. That, I think, will apply also to the question of finance. In many instances the conditions and circumstances of the locality will have a very material effect upon the expenditure which will be necessitated under the provisions of this Bill. In the case of a straggling county, for instance, the expense involved will be greater than in one which is well concentrated and where the various forces can meet together with greater facility. I have had some experience of dealing with the preparation of schemes and the application of schemes in local management in different directions; and I venture to say again, what I stated on the Second Reading of the Bill, that it appears to me that to allow a sufficient amount of elasticity in the preparation of these schemes will be far more likely to result in good work in the different parts of the country than to send down a cast-iron scheme from head-quarters.

The noble Marquess alluded to the Bill as one of which as a general measure he might speak with a certain amount of approval, but in which he found a number of gaps. I venture to suggest that the gaps which the noble Marquess finds in this measure really arise from the same circumstances as those to which I have alluded. In the matter of numbers, of which the noble Marquess spoke, I do not see how under present circumstances it would be possible to give any accurate estimate of numbers until the schemes for each county have been prepared and the whole matter brought into operation. As I have said, I do not wish to dwell on details. With regard to the questions raised by the noble Earl, Lord Mount-Edgcumbe, I believe that, when we come to the Amendments of which he has given notice, my noble friend behind me will be prepared to give him an answer.

I am glad that the noble Marquess recognises that this Bill has been presented to Parliament in a spirit of which he could approve, and that he was able to say that my right hon. friend the Secretary of State and my noble friend behind me had been always ready to consider, so far as it was possible, the adoption of any suggestion coming from the other side which could be incorporated in the Bill. I know there are some in this House, and especially my noble friend at the Table (the Earl of Wemyss), who still protest against interference with the Militia; but I do hope that the concessions which have been made in regard to the Militia and also the Yeomanry have been such as to inspire the feeling which the noble Marquess has expressed. I think I may say that they have shown that there is every disposition on our part to make the changes in this great scheme of reorganisation as little irksome as possible.

It is impossible, my Lords, in any such scheme not to come into contact with the feelings of those who are attached to the old system. But I do venture to repeat my opinion that this Bill is the first real attempt to give to our military system the powers of expansion beyond the Regular Forces of the Crown which we need; and as I believe it to be the wish of every one of your Lordships, even those who have most seriously criticised the provisions of the Bill, that these powers of expansion may prove real, I have no hesitation in asking your Lordships now to assent to the Third Reading of the Bill.

On Question, Motion agreed to; Bill read 3^a accordingly, with the Amendments.

THE EARL OF ERROLL moved an Amendment to Clause 1 (establishment of associations) to provide that during the first three years after the passing of the Act the appointment of the chairman and vice-chairman of the County Association should rest with the Army Council. He urged that the responsibility in this matter ought to belong to those who had worked out the details of the scheme. He confessed that at first he thought the decision arrived at by their Lordships on this matter was a sound one, but on second thoughts he had come to the conclusion that in the special circumstances of the case it would facilitate the working of the Bill if the Army Council had the appointment of the first chairman. But he agreed that when the associations had become firmly established it would be better that they should elect their own chairman.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 19, after the word 'for' to insert the words 'the appointment by the Army Council during the first three years after the passing of this Act, and subsequently for.'"—(*The Earl of Erroll.*)

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of PORTSMOUTH) said he had no objection to the

Amendment, which proposed to give effect to a suggestion that he had ventured to make to their Lordships when this particular clause was under discussion in Committee. In this matter he was in the hands of the House. He had heard from the Duke of Northumberland that he was quite willing to accept the Amendment, but he would like to know the view of his noble friend Lord Haversham upon it.

*LORD HAVERSHAM said that so far as he was concerned he strongly objected to the acceptance of the Amendment. The proposal was made by him, and from both sides of the House the opinion was expressed that the Chairman should always be elected by the Association.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE said that what really mattered was what the House thought now, not what was thought last week. Speaking entirely for himself, he felt strongly that if their Lordships refused to pass this Amendment they would be placing an unnecessary obstacle in the way of the Army Council. He agreed that once the associations were running it was absolutely necessary that they should have the election of the chairmen in their own hands. The Bill would obviously pass into law, and the earliest date at which any association could be started would be late in the autumn. But there was nothing to prevent the War Office, as soon as the months of August and September had passed by, from getting to work, appointing their chairmen, and proceeding with individual schemes so that they could be ready to start in full working order by the end of the year. Unless the Army Council had the power of setting up the local men with whom they would discuss the details it would be impossible to get the associations started smoothly and quickly. Therefore he felt, at the time the suggestion contained in the present Amendment was made by Lord Portsmouth, that it was a reasonable one, and that a special case had been made out for allowing the Army Council to appoint the first chairman and vice-chairman. But he would strongly deprecate a reversal to the original position of the Bill, by which the Army Council was to appoint the chairman for all time.

THE EARL OF CREWE: My Lords, this is really not a question of principle, but one of machinery. The general principle, that it is desirable that the chairman should be an elected person, is admitted by us all; but I confess that we do retain the opinion that while the schemes are getting into shape the Army Council should have the assistance of a chairman whom they themselves appoint. I hope, therefore, that my noble friend will not press his objection further.

LORD NEWTON did not see why the House should reverse their previous decision on this matter. He was quite unable to understand why it should be assumed that the associations would be incapable of electing the right person as chairman.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD LOVAT moved an Amendment to Clause 2 (powers and duties of Associations), to provide that the date at which regulations issued to County Associations embodying the requirements on mobilisation which are to be supplied locally, should be not later than 1st January, 1909. It had been impossible to extract from the Government either what would be the numbers of the Territorial Army, or at what date it was to be organised. At the present date that Army was absolutely unemployable for home defence, as it had got neither staff, organisation, nor transport, and could not be billetted. He trusted that His Majesty's Government would be able to accept this Amendment, otherwise they might have it said of them that they were unable to state within 500,000 how many men they were likely to get for the Territorial Force, and within a quarter of a century how soon they would be able to be mobilised.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 25, after the word 'regulations' to insert the words 'which shall be issued to County Associations not later than the first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and nine.'"—(*Lord Lovat.*)

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH assured the noble Lord that the question of mobilisation was being thoroughly considered by the General Staff. It was their desire not to lose any time, but a certain amount of elasticity was necessary. The question of home defence would have to be considered to a certain extent separately in each county, and it was possible and probable that for certain counties, in which there were towns or ports supposed to be specially liable to raids, mobilisation schemes would be settled upon much sooner than for others. They could not accept the Amendment, which would have no practical value. If after a reasonable interval the noble Lord had good ground to suppose that no steps had been taken in this matter, he could again raise the question in Parliament.

Viscount MIDLETON regretted the attitude adopted by the Government. What they feared was that under the new system they would simply have Volunteers and Yeomanry under a new name, but with an enormously increased expenditure. If the whole of the money to be voted by the Army Council was to be assigned to other purposes before the requirements for mobilisation had been laid down, then no progress would ever be made in the preparation for mobilisation. He ventured to say, with some authority, that the cost of mobilisation in the counties would be very great. If they were merely going to get all wagons and horses that would be required scheduled, even then there would have to be some small payment made. His fear was that the means and money would not be forthcoming to make provision for mobilisation at all. Lord Lovat had certainly touched one of the most vital points in the new organisation, and he hoped the Government would accept some such Amendment. Perhaps Lord Lovat's words were a little drastic. He would suggest to Lord Lovat to allow the Amendment to run so that these regulations should be issued to County Associations "from time to time, and on the first occasion not later than 1st January, 1909." That form would have the advantage that, while it would leave the Government practically a free hand to issue the regulations as they liked, it made it necessary for them within eighteen months to face the question of these mobilisation regulations. Of course, the Government would not be precluded from altering the regulations when they pleased.

Lord LOVAT accepted the suggestion of Viscount Midleton, and withdrew his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 25, after the word 'regulations' to insert the words 'which shall be issued to County Associations from time to time, and on the first occasion not later than the first day of January, 1909.'"—(*Viscount Midleton.*)

On Question, "That these words be here inserted," their Lordships divided:—Contents, 62; Not-Contents, 32.

CONTENTS.

Marlborough, D.
Portland, D.

Bath, M.
Camden, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Salisbury, M.

Abingdon, E.
Bathurst, E.
Camperdown, E.
Carnwath, E.
Cathcart, E.
Cawdor, E.
Clarendon, E.
Dartrey, E.
Denbigh, E.
Devon, E.
Halsbury, E.
Lauderdale, E.
Lonsdale, E.
Mar and Kellie, E.
Mayo, E.

Mount-Edgcumbe, E.
Nelson, E.
Roberts, E.
Romney, E.
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry.*)
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller.*]

Churchill, V. [*Teller.*]
Cross, V.
Falmouth, V.
Goschen, V.
Hardinge, V.
Hill, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*)
Knutsford, V.
Tredegar, V.

Abinger, L.
Ampthill, L.
Armstrong, L.
Ashbourne, L.
Balinhard, L. (*E. Southesk.*)

Barrymore, L.
Blythswood, L.
Brodrick, L. (*V. Midleton.*)
Clifford of Chudleigh, L.
Clinton, L.
Clonbrock, L.
Colchester, L.
Ellenborough, L.
Kenmare, L. (*E. Kenmare.*)
Kensington, L.
Killanin, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll.*)
Lawrence, L.
Lovat, L.
Newton, L.
Ravensworth, L.
Robertson, L.
Saltoun, L.
Seaton, L.
Shute, L. (*V. Barrington.*)
Sinclair, L.

The Earl of Portsmouth.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Loreburn, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Crewe, E. (*L. President.*)

Beauchamp, E.
Carrington, E.
Chesterfield, E.
Chichester, E.
Craven, E.
Durham, E.
Portsmouth, E.

Althorp, V. (*L. Chamberlain.*)
Esher, V.

Allendale, L.
Armitstead, L.
Burghclere, L.
Coleridge, L.
Courtney of Penwith, L.
Denman, L. [*Teller.*]
Elgin, L. (*E. Elgin and Kincardine.*)
Fitzmaurice, L.
Glantawe, L.

Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*) [*Teller.*]
Hamilton of Dalzell, L.
Haversham, L.
Lucas, L.
Nunburnholme, L.
O'Hagan, L.
Pirrie, L.
Shuttleworth, L.
Stanmore, E.
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran.*)
Tweedmouth, L.
Welby, L.

THE EARL OF MOUNT-EDGCUMBE moved the omission of Clause 8:—

"Subject to any directions which may be given by His Majesty, first appointments to the lowest rank of officer in any unit of the Territorial Force shall be given to persons recommended by the president of the Association for the county, if a person approved by His Majesty is recommended by the president for any such appointment within thirty days after notice of a vacancy for the appointment has been given to the president in the prescribed manner, provided he fulfils all the prescribed conditions as to age, physical fitness and educational qualifications; and where a unit comprises men of the Territorial Force of two or more counties, the recommendations for such appointments shall be made by the president of the Association for the respective counties in such rotation or otherwise as may be prescribed."

He had, he thought, fully explained, in his speech on the Motion for the Third Reading of the Bill, his reason for moving this Amendment.

Amendment moved—

"To leave out Clause 8."—(*The Earl of Mount-Edgcumbe.*)

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH said he was in some doubt as to the object of the Amendment, and he hoped it would not be pressed, as it was opposed to the whole spirit of the Bill. The president of the association would be in almost all cases the lord-lieutenant, but there might be cases in which the lord-lieutenant, although the *status* he would give to the association by being connected with it would be of great value, would not care to add to his already heavy duties the active work of the association. There might also be cases in which for other reasons the lord-lieutenant would not be a suitable person. Lord Newton had instanced the case of a lord-lieutenant being a Quaker. The Government desired that these appointments should rest in the hands of the president of the association, who they presumed would have the necessary local knowledge. He hoped that as the Amendment ran counter to the whole spirit of the Bill it would not be pressed.

THE EARL OF MOUNT-EDGCUMBE could not imagine that the gentleman who would be appointed president of an association would be likely to have more local knowledge than the lord-lieutenant. The clause did not place this duty in the hands of the County Association; it simply transferred it from the lord-lieutenant to an individual who was named by the Army Council. It seemed to him that this was really a move to alter the position of the lord-lieutenant in his relation to the Auxiliary Forces.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said the noble Earl the Under-Secretary had altogether failed to answer the noble Earl who had moved the Amendment, and who had shown most convincingly that there was no provision in the Bill making it certain that there would be an association in every county; and if it was made necessary that the first appointments should be by the president and there should happen to be no association, there would be a *casus omissus*. That was a difficulty which his noble friend Lord Mount-Edgcumbe was fully justified in pointing out. But the Amendment would hardly, perhaps, carry him to the full length he desired. The noble Earl's second object was that these appointments should rest with the lord-lieutenant, as at present. He (Lord Salisbury) could not make out why the Government did not adopt that course, but he was afraid that the Amendment as it stood on the Paper would not carry out the second object the noble Earl had in view. Still, the point the noble Earl made remained unanswered—that in cases where associations were not appointed it would be difficult to work the Territorial Force at all. The responsibility for that mistake in drafting would rest, of course, with the Government, and it was too late now for their Lordships to alter it.

*THE EARL OF ELGIN assumed that if there was no association it would be because there was no Territorial Force in the country. It was to meet that possible conjecture that the word "may" was used. He believed that if the noble Earl's Amendment were pressed, nomination to first commissions would rest with the King, as in the Regular Army.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

THE EARL OF MOUNT-EDGCUMBE explained that his next Amendment turned on the question whether the appointment of the County Associations was compulsory or permissive. He begged to move.

Amendment moved—

"In page 9, line 15, to leave out 'a' and to insert the word 'such,' and in lines 15 and 16 to leave out the words 'for which an association has been established under this Act' and to insert the words 'as he may select.'"—(*The Earl of Mount-Edgcumbe.*)

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH said the omission of these words would seriously interfere with the general purpose of the Bill. For enlistment purposes the county existed only in so far as it had an association, and the words proposed to be omitted were absolutely necessary to define the meaning. The recruit selected the particular unit to which he wished to be posted, but he was enlisted for the county to which that unit belonged. If the object of the noble Earl was to secure to the recruit the right of selecting his county he would see on reference to the latter part of Subsection (*a*) of the clause that the Bill not only guaranteed him such a right, but even the right to select any particular unit in that county.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The Marquess of Salisbury.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY moved to add to Paragraph (*c*) of Subsection (3), which relates to the transference to the associations of property belonging to or held for the benefit of Yeomanry and Volunteer units, the following:—"The corresponding unit of the Territorial Force shall, in the event of any such transfer, become entitled, notwithstanding the terms of any trust, limitation, or condition affecting the property so transferred, to the estate or interest in such property of the unit to the property of which the order relates; but, subject to this provision, the interest of any beneficiary other than such unit shall not, without the consent of such beneficiary, be affected. The order may, if it be deemed proper, having regard to the special circumstances of any case, provide for the appointment of special trustees to act together with or to the exclusion of the association in regard to any such property, and such special trustees may be the existing trustees of such property." He said he understood the Government were prepared to accept this Amendment. The object was to deal with certain mixed trusts existing in the case of the present Volunteer Force. There was certain property in which other persons as well as a Volunteer unit were interested. So far as the interests were not military interests, they would be saved by this provision.

Amendment moved—

"In page 21, line 29, after the word 'final' to insert the words 'The corresponding unit of the Territorial Force shall, in the event of any such transfer, become entitled, notwithstanding the terms of any trust, limitation, or condition affecting the property so transferred to the estate or interest in such property of the unit to the property of which the order relates; but, subject to this provision, the interest of any beneficiary other than such unit shall not, without the consent of such beneficiary, be affected. The order may, if it be deemed proper, having regard to the special circumstances of any case, provide for the appointment of special trustees to act together with or to the exclusion of the association in regard to any such property and such special trustees may be the existing trustees of such property.'"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH, in accepting the Amendment, said he wished to take that opportunity of stating that nothing would be done by the Army Council in reference to the transfer of property without full consultation with Volunteer officers with regard to the transfer of any of the properties of these units to County Associations.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill passed, and returned to the Commons; and to be printed as amended. (No. 129.)

QUALIFICATION OF WOMEN (COUNTY AND TOWN COUNCILS) (SCOTLAND) BILL [H.L.].

Amendments reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next.

INJURED ANIMALS ACT (1894) AMENDMENT BILL.

Read 3ª (according to order), and passed.

House adjourned at half-past Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 23*rd July*, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill [Lords]; Tynemouth Corporation (Water) Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill [Lords.]—As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Pasley Children Legitimisation Bill [Lords.]—As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [Lords]; Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords.]—Read a second time, and committed.

Colne Valley Water Bill [Lords.]—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to: Central London Railway Bill, without Amendment.

Richmond (Surrey) Electricity Supply Bill; North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to—Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [Lords]; without Amendment.

PETITIONS.

CONGO FREE STATE.

Petition from Birkenhead, for protection of the Native Races; to lie upon the Table.

LAND VALUES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Greenock, against; to lie upon the Table.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

Petition from Horncastle, against; to lie upon the Table.

SMALL LANDOWNERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Bathgate, against; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY TRADING.

Petition from Rowley Regis, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

WEEKLY REST-DAY BILL.

Petition from Tufnell Park and other places, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Regulations applicable to Schools for Blind, Deaf, Defective, and Epileptic Children [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TREATY SERIES (No. 21, 1907).

Copy presented, of Accession of the Commonwealth of Australia to the Industrial Property Convention of 1883, as modified by the additional Act of 1900, 5th August, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGES (GREAT BRITAIN) (GRANT IN AID).

Copies ordered, "of (1) Treasury Minute, dated the 31st day of January, 1906, appointing the Advisory Committee; (2) Treasury Minute, dated the 4th day of March, 1907, adding Mr. F. G. Ogilvie, C.B., to the Committee; (3) Report of Advisory Committee, dated the 6th day of June, 1907, with Appendix containing the Reports of the Inspectors; and (4) Treasury Minute on the Committee's Report, dated the 9th day of July, 1907."—*Mr. Runciman.*

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Emigrants from Scotland.

MR. J. D WHITE (Dumbartonshire): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will state what was the number of emigrants sailing from Scottish ports during the first six months of the present year, distinguishing, as far as possible, emigrants of Scottish nationality from emigrants of other nationalities passing through Scotland.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The particulars asked for by my hon. friend are as follows:—

Statement showing the Passenger Movement between Scottish ports and non-European countries during the six months January to June, 1907, distinguishing passengers of Scottish nationality.

	Scottish.	Other.	Total.
Number of passengers, outward - -	29,301	11,754	41,055
Number of passengers, inward - -	2,784	4,062	6,846
Balance outward - - -	26,517	7,692	34,209

Allowances to Staffs of Royal Ordnance Factory and Army Accounts Department.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will grant a statement showing the annual allowances, apart from travelling and subsistence allowances, in London, at home and abroad, permitted to each rank in the clerical staffs of the Royal

Ordnance Factories of the War Office and the Army Accounts Department, and the conditions under which these allowances are granted.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The information is as follows:—As regards the clerical staff of the ordnance factories no allowances are granted other than travelling and subsistence; in the event of a member of that staff going abroad on duty a special rate would no doubt be fixed. As regards the Army Accounts Departments, it is presumed that this Question refers to the directing staff only. Under normal conditions, no member of the directing staff of the Accounts Department is given an annual allowance while serving in London or at any other station at home. But members who previously belonged to the War Office staff were given a higher rate of pay on joining the Department (£50 additional in the case of staff clerks and £30 in the case of Second Division) as compensation for their new liability to serve away from London. Acting second-class assistant accountants are granted an allowance of £30 a year (in addition to their pay as Second Division clerks) while serving away from London. The civilian members of the directing staff who are serving abroad are granted a local allowance to cover the increased cost of living, as follow:—

	Accountant.	First-class assistants.	Second-class assistants.
	£	£	£
Cape Town - - - - - -	—	200	150
Other stations in South Africa - -	300†	220	150
Malta - - - - - - -	—	100	50
Straits Settlements - - - -	—	—	100
Ceylon - - - - - -	—	150	—
Bermuda - - - - - -	—	—	100
Mauritius - - - - - -	—	—	100
Jamaica - - - - - -	—	—	100

† Personal to the present holder of the appointment.

The allowance is issuable from the date of arrival in the command till the date of departure, and one-half is admissible during the official's absence from the command on ordinary leave.

Police Protection in Ireland.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state, by counties, the number of persons under constant protection and protection by patrols, respectively, on the 31st January, 30th June, and 31st December, 1906, and at the end of each month to 30th June, 1907.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The following statement shows the numbers of persons receiving special police protection (*a*) constant, (*b*) by patrols, on the dates mentioned:—

Counties, etc.	31st Jan., 1906.		30th June, 1906.		31st Dec., 1906.		31st Jan., 1907.		28th Feb., 1907.		31st March, 1907.		30th April, 1907.		31st May, 1907.		30th June, 1907.	
	Constant.	By Patrol.	Constant.	By Patrol.	Constant.	By Patrol.	Constant.	By Patrol.	Constant.	By Patrol.	Constant.	By Patrol.	Constant.	By Patrol.	Constant.	By Patrol.	Constant.	By Patrol.
Antrim	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Armagh	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Belfast City	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cavan	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	1
Donegal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Down	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fermanagh	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	2	—	2	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	1
Londonderry	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Monaghan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tyrone	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Carlow	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Dublin	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kildare	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
Kilkenny	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	1

King's - - - -	1	9	1	6	1	5	1	5	1	4	1	4	—	7	—	7	—	7
Longford - - - -	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	1
Louth - - - -	—	12	—	13	—	12	—	12	—	12	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Meath - - - -	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Queen's - - - -	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	1
Westmeath - - -	—	5	—	5	—	4	—	3	—	3	—	3	—	3	1	2	1	2
Wexford - - - -	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Wicklow - - - -	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Galway, East Riding -	5	18	8	23	8	26	5	29	5	29	6	29	6	29	6	28	8	32
Galway, West Riding -	2	4	2	5	2	5	2	5	2	5	4	5	4	5	3	5	3	7
Leitrim - - - -	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	1	1	1	1
Mayo - - - -	1	11	—	4		4	—	4	1	8	2	10	1	5	1	5	1	5
Roscommon - - -	1	4	1	8	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
Sligo - - - -	—	2	—	6	1	3	1	3	1	4	1	3	1	4	1	4	1	4
Clare - - - -	5	33	5	30	5	33	5	34	5	34	2	35	2	48	2	50	2	48
Cork, East Riding - -	8	28	8	14	8	15	9	14	9	14	8	15	8	14	8	13	8	13
Cork, West Riding -	—	4	1	3	3	5	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	5	5	5	5
Kerry - - - -	14	12	14	13	20	12	13	12	13	11	13	10	14	11	13	12	13	12
Limerick - - -	2	15	2	12	2	11	2	10	2	10	2	9	2	9	2	13	2	13
Tipperary, North Riding	1	3	1	2	—	3	—	3	—	3	—	3	—	2	—	2	—	2
Tipperary, South Riding	1	4	1	10	2	6	1	6	1	6	1	7	1	7	2	8	3	8
Waterford - - -	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total - - -	41	167	44	158	55	150	46	150	47	153	47	144	46	154	47	163	50	167

Grants to Training Colleges.

Viscount CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone): To ask the President of the Board of Education if he will state the number, accommodation, and amount of grants paid to training colleges and hostels, distinguishing the religious connections, in respect of the last completed session.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*)—

Table showing, under Denominations, the Number, Accommodation, and Amounts, of Grants paid to Training Colleges and Hostels in respect of the Session 1905–6:—

1. Training Colleges.

Denomination.	Number of Colleges.	Accommodation.		Grant to college.			Personal grant to day students.			Total grant.		
		Resident.	Day.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Church of England:												
Residential colleges for men	12	1,224	50	63,132	3	0	1,258	6	8	64,390	9	8
Residential colleges for women	21	2,106	375	80,482	14	5	3,700	0	0	84,182	14	5
Total Church of England	33	3,330	425	143,614	17	5	4,958	6	8	148,573	4	1
Wesleyan:												
Residential colleges for men	1	140	—	6,661	0	0	100	0	0	6,761	0	0
Residential colleges for women	1	129	12	4,836	0	0	80	0	0	4,916	0	0
Total Wesleyan	2	269	12	11,497	0	0	180	0	0	11,677	0	0
Roman Catholic:												
Residential colleges for men	1	106	—	4,379	0	0	—			4,379	0	0
Residential colleges for women	6	437	—	15,113	0	0	—			15,113	0	0
Total Roman Catholic	7	543	—	19,492	0	0	—			19,492	0	0
Undenominational:												
Residential colleges for men	2	213	1	11,300	0	0	25	0	0	11,325	0	0
Residential colleges for women	7	815	60	31,977	6	8	1,066	13	4	33,044	0	0
Residential colleges for men and women	1	31	—	192	0	0	—			192	0	0
Day colleges for men	4	—	264	2,632	6	8	3,412	13	4	6,045	0	0
Day colleges for women	2	—	303	3,939	0	0	5,977	0	0	9,916	0	0
Day colleges for men and women	15	—	2,752	29,779	0	0	45,327	6	8	75,106	6	8
Total Undenominational	31	1,059	3,380	79,819	13	4	55,808	13	4	135,628	6	8
Grand Total	79	5,201	3,817	254,423	10	9	60,947	0	0	315,370	10	9

2. Hostels.

Denominations.	Number of hostels.	Accommodation.	Grant to hostels.†		
Church of England:			£	s.	d.
Hostels for men - - - - -	1	Not fixed.	240	0	0
Hostels for women - - - -	4	79	1,318	0	0
Total Church of England -	5	79	1,558	0	0
Undenominational:					
Hostels for men - - - - -	2	28	1,035	0	0
Hostels for women - - - -	9	259	5,774	0	0
Total Undenominational - -	11	287	6,809	0	0
Grand Total - . - -	16	366	8,367	0	0

† In addition to these amounts, £466 13s. 4d. and £2,200 13s. 4d. was paid to certain recognised colleges of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, respectively, some of whose students are recognised as hostel students.

Army Clothing Contracts with Irish Firms.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state the nature, extent, and value of the clothing contracts placed with firms in Ireland during the past financial year.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Contracts for the following articles were placed with Irish firms during the past financial year:—

Army.

Description.			Number.	
Khaki drill clothing	Frocks - - - .		12,500	Total value (inclusive of materials issued by the Department), approximately, £28,420.
	Trousers - - - -		30,000	
Service dress clothing	Great Coats - - -		10,000	
	Jackets - - - -		27,500	
	Trousers - - - -		12,000	
Discharged Soldier's clothing	Suits - - - -		500	Total value, approximately, £6,600.
Hosiery -	Woollen drawers	pairs	14,400	
	„ socks	pairs	64,000	
Linen, black -	- -	yards	22,500	
Drabbet - -	- -	yards	33,000	
Thread -	Machine - -	reels	20,520	
	Sewing - -	reels	150,000	
	„ - -	skeins	743,000	

Royal Irish Constabulary.

Frocks - - - - - - - - - -		14,560	Total value (inclusive of material issued by the Royal Irish Constabulary), approximately, £23,700.
Tunics - - - - - - - - -		210	
Trousers - - - - - - - - -		19,460	
Overalls - - - - - - - - -		266	
Pantaloons - - - - - - - -		133	
Cloaks and capes with belts - - - -		30	
Great coats with capes - - - - - -		3,380	
Badges and chevrons - - - - - -		960	
Cloth - - - - - - -	yards	1,500	

Religious Instruction in Secondary Schools.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH: To ask the President of the Board of Education if he will state the number of schools recognised under the Regulations for Secondary Schools; the nature of the religious instruction given in those schools, distinguishing between Church of England, Roman Catholic, Wesleyan, other denominations, and religious instruction of an undenominational character; the number of scholars on account of whom grants were paid; and the amount of the grant.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) 1. The number of schools recognised for grants under the secondary school regulations in respect of the year 1905–6 (which is the last year for which grants have been paid) was 601. Grants amounting to £224,828 were paid in respect of 59,026 scholars in these schools. 2. In many cases the Board do not know what is the character of the religious instruction actually given in the schools, but the 601 schools referred to above may be classified as follows:—(*a*) 158 schools provided by local authorities, and therefore subject to the provisions as to the "Cowper-Temple Clause" relating to such schools, contained in Section 4, Education Act, 1902; (*b*) nineteen schools, for the maintenance of which local authorities are responsible, though they may not have provided the school in the technical sense. In four cases in this class the provisions of Section 4 of the Act of 1902, relating to religious instruction in provided schools, are included in the governing instrument, in two others the "Cowper-Temple Clause" of the Act of 1870 is embodied, and it may be assumed that in the remainder the religious instruction has no denominational character; (*c*) seventy-nine schools in which it is required by the governing instruments that religious instruction in accordance with the doctrines of the Church of England shall be given. It must not, however, be assumed that in all these cases instruction is actually given in the catechism or formularies of the Church; (*d*) forty-three schools conducted by persons or bodies in connection with the Roman Catholic Church; (*e*) eight schools similarly connected with other denominational bodies, viz.:—four connected with the Wesleyan Methodists; two connected with the Congregational body; one connected with the Friends; and one connected with the Bible Christians; (*f*) In the remaining 294 schools the governing instrument of the school either (i) directs that religious instruction in accordance with the principles of the Christain faith shall be given in the school; or (ii) directs that religious instruction shall be given under regulations to be made by the governors without restrictions on those regulations; or (iii) gives no directions as to religious instruction, or the provisions are merely permissive. In a few of the cases in Class (f), the governing instrument requires the head teacher to be a member of a particular denomination, or contains some other indication that a connection of the school with some denomination is contemplated. 3. The information immediately available in the Board's office does not enable them to state separately the number of schools, and consequently the amount of grants paid in respect of the scholars educated in the schools belonging to the above-mentioned categories. The number of schools assigned to each of the categories must be regarded as approximate.

Rupees Imported to Mombasa by the National Bank of India.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether the National Bank of India, through its Mombasa branch, imported between 1896 and 1902 more than ninety-five lakhs of Indian rupees; and whether the profit to the Government of India on this parcel at the then gold price of silver was at least £200,000.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I regret that I have no information as to the number of rupees imported to Mombasa by the National Bank of India during the years in question.

Profit on Rupee Coinage.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether, as the profit on the rupee coinage is at present not more than £4,000,000 sterling per annum, and that one-half of the profit is to be expended on the construction of new railways mileage in India, one-half of the estimated profit on the numbers of Indian rupees which are and have been imported and absorbed in East and Central Africa might similarly be employed in building railways in East and Central Africa.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I am unable to admit that the fact that the inhabitants of East Africa for their own convenience use Indian rupees gives them any claim to participate in the advantages derived by the Government of India from the profits of its own coinage.

Cost of Repatriation of Chinese Coolies.

Captain FABER (Hampshire, Andover): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the money voted during 1906–7 for the repatriation of Chinese coolies under the proclamation of last year was sufficient to meet the obligations involved.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) As far as is known the amount will be sufficient, but detailed accounts have not yet been received.

Captain FABER: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will state how many coolies have applied for repatriation during the present financial year; and when the Supplementary Estimate will be introduced to meet the expenditure.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The number, according to the latest information received, is 340. With regard to the second part of the hon. and gallant Gentleman's Question, the date fixed for the introduction of the Supplementary Estimate is Wednesday the 31st July.

Crown Colonies and Self-Governing Dependencies.

Mr. H. J. TENNANT (Berwickshire): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what steps have been taken to carry out the proposals for a clearer demarcation in the Department between Crown Colony work and that relating to the Self-governing Dependencies; and whether progress has been made with the establishment of the secretariat to the Imperial Conferences.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The subject matter of my hon. friend's Question is receiving the active attention of the Secretary of State, and a decision will not be long delayed.

Salvage Claim on Nets of Alexander Smith, of Cellardyke.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the case of Alexander Smith, a fisherman, of Cellardyke, whose nets were taken, on or about 2nd February last, to the Elie Coastguard Station under the misapprehension that they had been abandoned or lost at sea; whether, when this fact was explained, the nets were not delivered to their owner, but a claim made of £4 for salvage; whether these nets were left out all night in frost and snow and suffered damage thereby; how many days and nights they were so exposed; whether these nets are now to be sold by auction; and whether, seeing that the owner, a hard-working man, has been deprived of the use of them ever since the beginning of February and has thus suffered financial loss, which he can ill afford, he will cause the nets to be handed over, without payment, to their owner and grant him some compensation for the loss he has sustained.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I am aware of the circumstances in this case. I am advised that the nets in question, having been found adrift, were properly brought as wreck by the finder to the chief officer of Coastguard at Elie as representing the receiver, and that Section 546 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, accordingly operated to give the salvor a claim for reasonable salvage. It became the duty of the receiver under Section 552 of that Act to detain the nets pending a settlement of the claims or until security, which in this case was fixed at £4, had been given. I understand that the chief officer of Coastguard did everything in his power to protect the nets, but that while they were spread out to dry and in his absence on duty a snowstorm unfortunately came on and covered them. They were then dried and stored as soon as possible, and I am informed that they do not appear to be any worse for their exposure. The receiver was instructed by the Board to endeavour to effect an agreement between the salvor and the owner of the nets, but though the claim of the former was substantially reduced the owner still objected to pay, and his solicitors stated that the receiver could keep the nets. In these circumstances instructions have been given for the sale of the nets by auction, and the proceeds, if any remain after the settlement of salvage and expenses, will be handed to the owner, but I cannot hold out any hope that he will be paid anything beyond such balance.

Public Elementary Schools Transferred from "Non-provided" to "Provided" Class.

MR. ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): To ask the President of the Board of Education what was the number of public elementary schools transferred from the class of non-provided to provided between 1st January, 1906, and 30th June, 1907; how many of such were so transferred from the Anglican, Roman Catholic, or other denominations or bodies, respectively; and what is the total school space therein and the total number of children in average attendance thereat.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*)

Number, Accommodation, and Average Attendance of Voluntary Schools transferred to Local Education Authorities between 1st January, 1906 and 30th June, 1907. The Average Attendance is for the Statistical Year, 1905–6—

Denomination.	Number.	Accommodation.	Average Attendance.
Church of England - -	69	15,943	12,512
Roman Catholic - - -	—	—	—
Wesleyan - - - - -	33	13,331	10,017
Undenominational and others -	91	26,263	18,800
Total - - -	193	55,537	41,329

Exclusion from School on Account of Ringworm

DR. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether his attention has been drawn to the exclusion, from September, 1906, to the present date, of Ellen and Edward George from the Rolls Road London County Council School on the ground that they are suffering from ringworm; whether the certificate excluding these children from school was signed by a nurse; whether he is aware that, on the children being taken to the London Hospital for treatment, the parents were told that the children were not suffering from ringworm but steatorrhœa, a non-infective disease; whether, although the parents have given the teacher a certificate complying with Section (C,) Subsection 10, Article 3, of the School Management Code, the children are still refused admission; whether this exclusion is in opposition to the wishes of the managers of the school, who are anxious that the children should return; whether the nurse on whose certificate the children were excluded possesses any medical qualification; if not, whether a medical certificate given by an unqualified person can exclude a child from school; and whether his Department propose to take any, and, if any, what, action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The Board of Education have no information as to the incidents referred to. In the event of an appeal being made to them on the ground that the children have been excluded from school on other than reasonable grounds, the circumstances will be carefully investigated before a decision is arrived at.

Collection of Rates– Cost of Legal Proceedings.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in view of the fact that during last year 238,253 persons were summoned in the metropolitan boroughs for non-payment of rates, resulting in the issue of 74,573 distraint warrants and the committal to prison of 882 out of 4,135 persons against whom warrants were issued, will he take such steps as may be necessary to secure a uniform system in the charges made for the summons and for hearing and serving.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The fees mentioned do not vary much. In the Metropolitan Police Courts the fee for a summons is 2s., and this could not be reduced; while summonses issued by county justices cost 1s. or 6d. There is, so far as I can ascertain, no fee for hearing; and the fee for service is generally 1s. Legislation would be necessary to enforce entire uniformity; and I cannot see my way to undertake legislation.

Motor Car Accidents.

MR. WEIR: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can now state how many motor-car accidents occurred in the provinces during the years 1905 and 1906, respectively, the number of deaths resulting therefrom, and the number of cases of personal injury.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I beg to answer this Question on behalf of my right hon. friend. I cannot give the number of personal injuries resulting from motor accidents, and no separate record is kept of the number of fatalities occurring outside London, but the following particulars of the number of deaths in England and Wales, including the Metropolitan Police district, returned by coroners' juries as having been caused by motor vehicles in the years 1905 and 1906, have been furnished me by the Registrar-General. The figures for 1906 are provisional, and subject to slight revision:—

Nature of vehicle.	1905.			1906.		
	Males.	Females.	Total.	Males.	Females.	Total.
Motor car or carriage - - -	39*	23*	62	91†	31	122
Motor cycle - - - -	12	3	15	12	—	12
Motor omnibus - - - -	8	3	11	54	5	59
Electric tram - - - -	43	10	53	16‡	14	30
Steam tram - - - -	2	1	3	—	—	—
Traction engine - - - -	17	1	18	20	—	20
Motor (including steam) dray waggon, etc. - - - -	14‡	—	14	24‡	2	26
Steam roller - - - -	6	—	6	3‡	—	3
	141	41	182	220	52	272

* Including one case in which the coroner's jury returned a verdict of manslaughter.

† Including one case in which the coroner's jury returned verdicts of murder, two of manslaughter and one of suicide.

‡ Including one case in which the coroner's jury returned a verdict of suicide.

Local Government Board Report—Delay in Publication.

MR. WEIR: To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state the cause of the delay in issuing the Report of the Local Government Board; and will arrangements be made, as in other Departments, for the issue of the Report before the Vote was taken.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) Some of the information contained in the Report relates to the year ended 31st March, and is not received by the Local Government Board until some time after that date. It is not practicable, therefore, that the Report should be issued before the Vote for the Department is taken.

Sanitary Condition of St. Asaph Rural District.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that, at a recent meeting of the St. Asaph (Flintshire) Rural District Council, several members of the council took exception to some statements in the report of the medical officer of health representing parts of the district to be insanitary; and, seeing that the Local Government Board medical inspector has not visited the district since 1882, will he consider the expediency of deputing one of the Board's inspectors to report on the sanitary condition of the district.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The facts appear to be as stated. I will give consideration to the suggestion that a medical inspector should visit the district and report on its sanitary condition.

District Councils and the Public Health Act, 1875.

MR. WEIR: To ask the President of the Local Government Board, in view of the fact that the last published Report of the Local Government Board shows, at page 74, that during the year 1905 the Board dealt with several complaints against district councils who had made default in the performance of their duty, as required under Section 299 of the Public Health Act, 1875, will he state how many complaints of this character have been dealt with during the year 1906; and how the figures compare with those for the previous year.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) Seven cases were dealt with in 1906 as against five in the previous year.

Shareholders of Trawling Companies Membership of the Scottish Fishery Board.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state whether any members of the Fishery Board for Scotland are shareholders or directors of trawling companies.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I am not aware. But no doubt it is possibly so. For the Sea Fisheries Regulation (Scotland) Act, 1895, under which they are appointed, expressly provides, Section 4 (1), that they shall be representative of the various sea fishing interests of Scotland.

Holdings not Liable to Sub-Division under the Small Landowners Bill.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he has formed any estimate as to the number, area, and rental of holdings between fifty and 150 acres in Scotland which will not be liable to sub-division under the Small Landowners Bill, and of the number of acres within urban areas that will likewise remain immune for purposes of extensive cultivation under this measure.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) No, Sir. The Board of Agriculture Returns afford no material for such Estimates.

Pension for late Sub-Postmistress of Gorton.

MR. HODGE (Lancashire, Gorton): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the late sub-postmistress of Gorton served the Post Office in that capacity for a period of twenty-five years; and that, in view of the fact that she was only on the establishment nine years and six months, no pension was given her; whether it is the rule in some instances that unestablished services may count towards pension; and whether, in view of the good work performed for so many years and the fact that the postmistress was compulsorily retired for reasons of ill-health, he will consider sympathetically the merits of this claim for a pension.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton*): The late sub-postmistress of Gorton did not become an established officer of the Post Office until 1897, when she gave up her private business and devoted her whole time to the Post Office work. Unestablished full-time service may in some cases be counted for pension, but part-time service, such as that of a sub-postmistress carrying on a private business, is invariably excluded. I am sorry it is not practicable to grant the sub-postmistress a pension.

Improvement of Sanitary Conditions of the Island of Lewis.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state when the funds will be forthcoming to enable the Secretary for Scotland to take such steps as may be necessary to meet the sanitary requirements of the townships in the island of Lewis and remedy the evils disclosed in the Report of Dr. Dittmar, the medical inspector for the Local Government Board for Scotland.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I have been asked by the Secretary to the Treasury to reply to this Question, but I can only refer my hon. friend to the Answer given to him on the 8th instant.†

Evicted Tenant—Application of Mathias Brady.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement from Mathias Brady, Corraho, Stradone, county Cavan, whose father was evicted in 1882 for non-payment of rent by Charles B. Marley out of his holding in Gortnakillue; will he say whether this farm is on the landlord's hands, and, if not, whether anyone resides upon it; and whether the applicant, who has returned from Scotland to get possession of his old home, will be reinstated at an early date.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have investigated the application in Question, and have decided to take no action upon it. The holding has been divided, and is now occupied by two tenants who are unwilling to surrender, and, moreover, the applicant is stated to have been working in a steel factory in Scotland for the past eight years.

Dublin Police and Intoxicated Persons entering Licensed Premises.

MR. J. P. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Police Inspector Cushion stated on oath, during the hearing of a licensing prosecution in the Dublin police courts on the 31st May, that the order of 13th December, 1902, instructing members of the force that where they observed a drunken person entering licensed premises it was their duty to call the attention of the proprietor or his assistants to his condition, did not apply to constables as distinguished from officers of higher rank; and whether, having regard to the fact that the order was referred to publicly in court by counsel engaged in the case and by the magistrate, who both commented upon the neglect of duty upon the part of the constable who was examined as a witness, he will cause further inquiry to be made into the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am informed by the Chief Commissioner of the Dublin Metropolitan Police that the facts are precisely as stated in the reply which I gave on 13th June‡ to the hon. Member's previous Question on this subject. The order referred to in the Question applies to constables as well as to other members of the force, and Inspector Cushion made no statement to the contrary. The constable who gave evidence of the alleged offence stated on cross-examination that he was aware of the order, but did not warn the publican in this particular case because he did not observe the drunken person entering the public house. The Chief Commissioner informs me that all members of the force are well acquainted with the order.

Anti-Typhoid Inoculation of British Troops.

SIR W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether any official statistics exist in regard to anti-typhoid inoculation of British troops serving in India or in South Africa; if so, will he lay them upon the Table; whether any order has been issued by the Commander-in-Chief in India in reference to anti-typhoid inoculation; and, if so, will he state its terms.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) A large number of Returns relating to anti-typhoid inoculation have recently been received both from India and South Africa, and the work of compiling this information in statistical form is at present in progress, but some considerable time must necessarily elapse before the work is completed. Anti-typhoid inoculations are being largely carried out in India under the general direction of the Commander-in Chief, but the War Office is not aware of the terms of the specific orders issued by him.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxvii., 1165.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, clxxv., 1613.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Destroyers on the China Station.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty how many destroyers there are on the China station, and how many of these are in full commission all the year round, and how many in reserve.

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. LAMBERT, Devonshire, South Molton): Seven, five with full crews and two with nucleus crews.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): Can the hon. Gentleman say why since July, 1906, the number of destroyers has been reduced from thirteen to seven?

MR. LAMBERT: No, Sir. The reduction is made at the discretion of the Admiralty, who must be the sole judge in this matter.

Destroyers in the Mediterranean.

MR. HUNT: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty how many destroyers there are at Gibraltar and on the Mediterranean station; and how many of these are in full commission all the year round, and how many in reserve.

MR. LAMBERT: None at Gibraltar; eleven on the Mediterranean station in commission with full crews all the year round.

MR. BELLAIRS asked why there had been a reduction of destroyers on the Mediterranean station from thirty-four to eleven.

MR. LAMBERT was unable to add anything to his reply to a similar Question as to the destroyers on the China station.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Why are there so many destroyers? Whom do we want to destroy?

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): What has happened to the other destroyers? Have they been sent to the Kyles of Bute?

MR. LAMBERT: They are in home waters.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) asked the hon. Gentleman to indicate to the House what were the circumstances which had influenced the Admiralty in their reduction of the force of destroyers.

MR. LAMBERT was sure that the right hon. Gentleman, having had experience of the responsibility of office, would not expect him to make a statement, in answer to a Question, on a large question of policy.

The Coastguard.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether it is intended to reduce the number of Coastguard stations, or merely the number of Coastguards quartered in such stations; what substitute will be provided for the purposes of watching the movement of foreign war vessels and of maintaining signal communication with our own fleets; and what occupation will be provided for retiring seamen and petty officers of His Majesty's fleets in the place of Coastguard service.

MR. LAMBERT: The question of the future constitution of the Coastguard is under consideration, and a final decision has not yet been arrived at.

MR. COURTHOPE: Is the hon. Gentleman prepared to lay on the Table the Report of the Inter-Departmental Committee, which contains a full answer to all these questions?

MR. LAMBERT asked for notice.

MR. COURTHOPE: Will the hon. Gentleman answer the Question on the Paper?

MR. LAMBERT: I have already stated that no decision has yet been arrived at.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): Will one be come to before the end of the session?

MR. LAMBERT asked for notice.

H.M.S. "Edward VII." Rudder.

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he has called for any reports of experts as to whether an inspector with personal experience of foundry work might have been expected to discover the flaw in the rudder-casting recently supplied for H.M.S. "Edward VII."; and, if so, whether he will lay the reports upon the Table.

MR. LAMBERT: The staff of inspectors consists of persons of long and large experience in foundry work, and I am informed that this defect could not have been detected by visual inspection.

MR. COURTHOPE: Will the Admiralty consider the advisability of calling in as experts men of practical experience?

MR. LAMBERT: We do not see any necessity; our inspectors are men of large experience in these matters. This was a very exceptional case.

MR. COURTHOPE: But only last week the hon. Gentleman said the inspectors had had no practical experience.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle): Have they had experience in foundry work?

MR. LAMBERT: No practical experience in the sense that they have worked in a foundry, but they have had large experience in superintending this class of work for the Admiralty, which is perfectly satisfied with them.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that engineers in general know less about foundry work than of any other department?

[No Answer was returned].

Warships in West Indian Waters.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can now say what proportion of each year the ships which are to cruise on the Atlantic coast and West Indian waters will be allocated to cruising in the West Indies?

MR. LAMBERT: This Question so entirely depends on administrative arrangements connected with the training service that a precise reply is hardly possible, but probably the Fourth Cruiser Squadron will visit the West Indies for the same period, and at about the same time of year, as the former permanent North American and West Indian Squadron.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): Have any steps been taken to secure a contribution towards the cost from the Colonial Government?

MR. LAMBERT asked for notice.

Life of a Destroyer.

MR. BELLAIRS: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that the life of a destroyer is officially reckoned in Germany as twelve years, and that by the time of the submission of next year's programme no less than ninety British destroyers will belong to programmes introduced over twelve years ago; and whether the replacement of the larger number of these craft will receive the close consideration of the Government when they frame the new shipbuilding programme this autumn?

MR. LAMBERT: The Board in framing destroyer-building programmes consider not only the age of destroyers built but their condition, and have not adopted any time limit. This and all other questions with regard to the replacement of obsolescent vessels of war will receive close attention before the new programme is submitted to Parliament under Vote 8, 1908-9.

Number of Destroyers.

MR. BELLAIRS: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what have been the respective numbers of destroyers laid down or projected by Great Britain and Germany for eleven years under the programmes of 1897-8 and subsequent years, after deducting any of these vessels which were subsequently lost or struck off; and whether he will at the same time state the largest number of destroyers we have had stationed abroad at any one time.

MR. LAMBERT: The numbers are—Great Britain, seventy-three destroyers, of which two have been lost; Germany, seventy-two destroyers and one divisional torpedo boat. The largest number of destroyers that we have ever had stationed abroad is forty-seven.

H.M.S. "Renown."

MR. GRETTON (Rutland): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if H.M.S. "Renown" is still fitted as a royal yacht for special service; what part of that ship's armament is now on shore; and if this ship is included in the Return of Fleets as a unit of the Fleet immediately available for war service.

MR. LAMBERT: The "Renown" has special fittings still remaining on board, and that part of the secondary armament which is landed can be replaced within the five days allotted to vessels in the Special Service List to be ready for war service. The "Renown" is included in this category.

MR. GRETTON: What part of the secondary armament remains on board?

[No Answer was returned.]

Defence of Home Waters.

MR. GRETTON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the Commander-in-Chief of the Channel Fleet is held responsible for the defence of home waters; and, if so, whether, in view of this fact, the Board will reconsider its decision depriving that officer of control of the fully-commissioned torpedo flotilla in home waters.

MR. LAMBERT: The Admiralty are responsible for all matters of naval defence, and they arrange the responsibilities of the officers under their orders at their sole discretion.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: When may we expect an invasion?

MR. GRETTON asked if the Commander of the Channel Fleet was not responsible for the defence of home waters.

MR. LAMBERT: No, the Board of Admiralty must be regarded as responsible.

Fleet Cruisers.

MR. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether some intimation could be made by the Admiralty, either through the Press or to the local authorities, of the intention of any part of His Majesty's Fleet to visit any port in the British Isles, so as to prevent any uncertainty as to the date of call, the strength of the Fleet, and the number of the officers and men employed.

MR. LAMBERT: I presume that the hon. Member's Question arises out of the incident at Edinburgh during the recent visit of the Channel Fleet, and it is hoped that the arrangements to be made in future will obviate the recurrence of the inadvertence on that occasion to make the necessary communication to the local authorities.

Naval Statistics—Ships in full Commission.

MR. HUNT: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty the number of ships in full commission, excluding ships specially mobilised for manœuvres, on 15th July, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906, and 1907.

MR. LAMBERT: The numbers were as follows—

1903 - - - -	254
1904 - - - -	245
1905 - - - -	223
1906 - - - -	211
1907 - - - -	246

The Shooting Team for the Colonies.

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that for a number of years past representative shooting teams from Canada, Australia, and other Colonies have visited England, and that the Colonial Governments have made grants in aid of the expenses of the teams representing their respective Colonies; and whether, in view of the above facts, he will make a grant in aid of the expenses of the team representing the Mother Country which, for the first time, will shortly visit Canada and Australia.

The following Question also appeared on the Paper:—

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is is aware that, for a number of years past, representative shooting teams from Canada, Australia, and other Colonies have visited England, and that the Colonial Governments have granted separation allowance to the non-commissioned officers and men forming part of such teams; and whether, in view of the above facts, he will afford similar facilities to the non-commissioned officers and men of the team representing the Mother Country which, for the first time, will shortly visit Canada and Australia.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. BUCHANAN, Perthshire, E.): The War Office has no information with regard to the payment of separation allowances by the Colonial Governments. The entire expense of the visit of the British team to the Colonies will be borne by the National Rifle Association.

MR. COURTHOPE asked whether the hon. Gentleman intended to answer the Question addressed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): I have no information on the subject.

MR. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan): Will the right hon. Gentleman tell the House what is the practice of the Australian Government in these matters?

MR. ASQUITH: I do not know, Sir. I will see if it is possible to get the information.

MR. COURTHOPE asked the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he was aware that inquiries were made some months ago by the War Office as to what was the practice of the Australian Government.

MR. BUCHANAN: Whether inquiries were made or not I am not prepared to state, but we have no information whatever as to what the practice of the Australian Government is. The Secretary of State gave his assent to a portion of the Regular Forces forming part of the team for Canada and Australia, but on this condition, that no part of the expense involved should be borne by the War Office.

MR. COURTHOPE: Am I to understand then that the Government wish to discourage rifle shooting?

MR. BUCHANAN: No, certainly not.

Queen's Barracks, Perth.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office how much money is to be spent during the present financial year in improving the accommodation at Queen's Barracks, Perth.

MR. BUCHANAN: A sum of about £500 will probably be spent this financial year on improving the accommodation of these barracks, and a further sum of about £800 will be spent on maintenance.

Duke of Devonshire and Old Soldiers.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to correspondence which has passed between Mr. Fitzgerald, of the estate office, Lismore Castle, Lismore, and the colonel commanding the Royal Engineers, Dublin Sub-district, with reference to an application for a Protestant Royal Engineer pensioner to fill the position of timekeeper and overseer on the Duke of Devonshire's estate; and whether the officer concerned has any explanation to offer of his action in the matter.

MR. BUCHANAN: It appears from the correspondence that Mr. Fitzgerald applied to the Commanding Royal Engineer in Dublin for the services of a Royal Engineer pensioner, and stipulated that he should be a Protestant. In endeavouring to obtain a man for the appointment the Commanding Royal Engineer duly specified the conditions required by Mr. Fitzgerald. The action of the Commanding Royal Engineer does not seem to require any explanation.

MR. O'SHEE: But why should facilities be given to outsiders at all, if men are to be excluded by reason of their religion?

MR. BUCHANAN denied that any special facilities were given, and added that the War Office had no right to interfere with regard to the qualifications insisted upon by a private individual.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Will the hon. Gentleman see that Catholics are informed how they are likely to be treated if they join the Army?

MR. BUCHANAN: This was not treatment applied to an individual in the Army; it was simply facilitating the employment of persons who had left the Army.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Will it be made known that only Protestant ex-soldiers will be employed by the Duke of Devonshire, while Catholics will pass into the workhouse to end their days?

MR. BUCHANAN: That is a matter for the Duke of Devonshire.

Army Pensions.

MR. CLYNES (Manchester, N.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to the numerous cases of drunkenness, disturbance, and other evils in which pensioners were concerned following last Army pension day; whether he has observed that many of these evils are attributed to the present system of paying pensions; whether regulations would permit pension money to be paid in smaller but more frequent sums, so that the money might be better used; and, if so, whether he can take early action to institute more regular payment of these pensions.

MR. BUCHANAN: I believe that such cases do sometimes occur after the quarterly pay-day, and it has been represented that some benefit may be derived from the payment of pensions in smaller sums at more frequent intervals. The question was referred to a Committee under the chairmanship of the Paymaster-General, and the Report of this Committee is now under the consideration of the Army Council.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): And men are breaking down week after week because it is too much trouble for the Army Council to issue an order. It is time some one got indignant.

MR. BUCHANAN: It is an exceedingly important question and must have proper consideration.

Range Markers and the Workmen's Compensation Act.

MR. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he is aware that according to counsel's opinion, recently taken, certain members of the Volunteer force, comprising markers employed on ranges, members of advanced and rear parties on fatigue duty in connection with annual camps, and bandsmen in receipt of pay, will, in case of injury, come under the provisions of the Workmen's Compensation Act, together with civilians necessarily employed by Volunteer Corps, such as cooks and mess waiters; and whether it is intended that the liability shall fall on the commanding officer.

MR. BUCHANAN: The position under the Workmen's Compensation Act in regard to liabilities for injuries received under these and similar circumstances is now being considered by the legal advisers of the War Department.

Victoria Barracks, Windsor.

MR. J. F. MASON (Windsor): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he anticipates that the actual building of Victoria Barracks, Windsor, will be commenced this autumn; and how long such building is expected to occupy before completion.

MR. BUCHANAN: It is anticipated that this work will be commenced this autumn, and will extend over a period of about two years.

Plague in India.

MR. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the estimates given by the Indian Statistical Department of the plague victims in the year 1904 varied between highest and lowest in round figures 200,000; and whether he will look into the administration of this Department with a view to the matter presented for publication being made intelligible and consistent.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. MORLEY, Montrose Burghs): The extreme variation to which my hon. friend calls attention is due to the fact that the higher figure refers to the whole of India, including the native State, and the lower one to British India only. The figure which I quoted in replying to a Question on the 8th instant was taken from a special Return recently published by the Government of India, and differs from the figure given in their annual Sanitary Report, from which the statistics given in the Moral and Material Progress Report and the Statistical Abstract are taken. I have asked for an explanation of the discrepancy.

Alarmist Telegrams from India.

MR. O'GRADY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether, with a view to preventing alarmist telegrams being sent to the Press in this country, and of the effect such telegrams are creating as to the present state of order in India, he will give instructions that the same regulations as issued in the case of certain of the native Press shall apply to the correspondents referred to.

MR. MORLEY: I am not aware that any regulations have been issued to the native Press. But the Government of India have warned the public of their intention to enforce the ordinary law relating to seditious publications in India. There is no Indian law or regulation that enables me to exercise a censorship over the telegrams sent to this country.

MR. O'GRADY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the correspondents mentioned in this Question are those of Reuter's, *The Times*, and the *Daily Mail?* In view of the telegrams being based on the flimsiest of evidence, and upon the most insignificant facts, and the effect they have in India, can the right hon. Gentleman not take steps to censure both the correspondents and the papers in question.

MR. MORLEY: Nobody will recognise more freely than my hon. friend that this is very delicate ground. It is practically impossible for me or the Government of India to dictate to newspapers what telegrams they shall or shall not publish.

Coconada Disturbances.

MR. O'GRADY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that a force of punitive police are quartered upon the inhabitants of Coconada and that the town has to bear the cost; and whether, having regard to the fact that the recent disturbance arose through an assault committed by Surgeon Kemp on a young student for crying Bande Mataram, and that the case is now pending in the Law Courts against Surgeon Kemp for the said assault, he will cause inquiries to be made as to the present state of order, with a view to the removal of the police.

MR. MORLEY: The recent disturbances at Coconada led the Government of Madras to consider additional police necessary. The law provides that the town should bear the cost. As at present advised, I do not conceive it to be a transaction in which it is my duty to intervene.

* MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the action of the Madras Government in this behalf has given profound satisfaction to the loyal and law-abiding inhabitants of that Presidency.

[No Answer was returned.]

Case of Habil Sircar.

MR. O'GRADY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the case of Emperor v. Habil Sircar, in which the trying magistrate stated that the prosecution produced evidence showing that the accused read a notice to a crowd of Mussulmans at Dewanganj, and had told them that the Government and the Nawab of Dacca had passed orders that nobody would be punished for plundering and oppressing Hindus, and that soon after the Hindoo image of the goddess Kali was broken by the Mussulmans, and the shops of Hindu traders plundered; whether, as a result of his judgment in the case, the magistrate (a Mahomedan) was removed to another district; and, if so, will he give instructions for an investigation into this and cases of a like character that had occurred at Jamalpur and Mymensingh, and for the Report to be laid upon the Table of the House.

MR. MORLEY: I have no official information on the subject, but I will inquire.

Somaliland—Government Officials' Allowances.

*CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can now state if the Government officials up country in Somaliland will be allowed a money equivalent for furniture, considering that the officials on the coast are allowed furniture.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): Having regard to the facts that the salaries of the political staff in Somaliland are fixed on a more liberal scale than those of the administrative officers on the coast, that their duties require them continually to move about among the tribes, and that camp equipment and sufficient transport and travelling allowances are issued to them, the Secretary of State does not see any good reason for adopting the suggestion of the hon. and gallant Member. Lord Elgin has no knowledge of any promise made by the Colonial Office to the assistant political officers that they would either receive furniture or an equivalent, and I should be glad if the hon. and gallant Member would furnish me with information which would make it possible to trace any communication bearing on the subject.

Transvaal Loan Bill.

*CAPTAIN FABER: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether His Majesty's Government has now approved the Draft Bill being passed by the Transvaal Parliament to authorise the guaranteed loan of £5,000,000; and if he will lay upon the Table a copy of the sanctioned Bill.

MR. CHURCHILL: His Majesty's Government have been in communication with the Transvaal Government and have intimated generally their approval of the terms of a Draft Bill. They are now awaiting further information from the Transvaal. A copy of the Bill as passed by the Transvaal Parliament will be included among the Papers which will be published before the Resolution preliminary to the introduction of a Loan Bill is brought before the House.

*CAPTAIN FABER asked if all the £5,000,000 would be issued this year.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Chancellor of the Exchequer has already stated that only £1,000,000 will be needed before the end of June next year.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) asked if the question would come before the House in the form of a Bill.

MR. CHURCHILL: A Loan Bill will have to be introduced.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): Will it be before the end of this session?

MR. CHURCHILL: Most certainly.

New Hebrides.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can now say when the New Hebrides Convention between England and France will be proclaimed; and whether the Government has received any communication from the Australian authorities complaining of the disabilities under which the British traders labour owing to delay in proclamation.

MR. CHURCHILL: His Majesty's Government have been for some time aware, both from communications of the Australian Government and from other sources, that British subjects in the New Hebrides labour under a commercial disadvantage, because they are forbidden to supply arms, ammunition, and liquor to natives, while French citizens are not subject to such a prohibition. They are in communication with the French Government on the question of the prohibition of the export of liquor, etc., to the New Hebrides. With regard to the proclamation of the Convention, I have nothing to add to the Answer which I gave yesterday to the hon. and gallant Member for St. Andrew's Burghs.

SIR GILBERT PARKER asked whether it was the case that the proclamation could not be made until the Pacific Islanders (Amendment) Act was passed.

MR. CHURCHILL said that was a legal point he could not answer without notice.

St. Helena.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether it is proposed to make to St. Helena a grant for the repair and necessary up-keep of the roads, to which reference is made in the Governor's Report; and, in view of the distress which exists in the island and the privation to which women and children are subjected, and that a great many of the men have had to emigrate for a term of years to work in the mines, leaving their families behind them, whether a special relief grant will be given.

MR. CHURCHILL: It is not proposed to make a grant for the repair of the roads which have hitherto been maintained out of Army funds for military purposes. A grant of £300 for relief of distress was made recently. This grant has been expended. It is not proposed to make any further grant for this purpose, as the Secretary of State has reason to believe that further employment, in addition to that secured by 100 labourers who have been engaged by the Namaqualand Copper Company, will shortly be provided out of the grant-in-aid for flax growing and other sources.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that labourers from St. Helena have been refused permission to work in the Transvaal mines?

MR. CHURCHILL was understood to reply that some difficulty had arisen.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what steps, if any, the Government intend to take to secure employment for the distressed inhabitants of St. Helena until the flax industry, which is being established, and which takes four or five years to develop, will give them work to do.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Secretary of State is making inquiries in various quarters as to the possibility of opening up new sources of employment. A large batch of labourers has recently been engaged for South Africa, and it is understood that workings on a concession for exploiting the phosphate deposits of the island will shortly be commenced. The preliminary operations in connection with the flax will also absorb some labour. Consequently I hope the number of those likely to remain unemployed is not likely to be such as to require any further direct action by the Government at present.

Orange River Colony Farm Valuations.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will state what arrangements have been made by the Government of the Orange River Colony to meet the general request of the settlers, Dutch and British, for a revaluation of their farms; and whether the arrangements will come into force before the new Government assumes administration.

MR. CHURCHILL: I do not know that I can add anything to my Answer to the hon. Member on 9th July,† beyond that the legislation there referred to is to be passed by the existing Legislative Council. The Draft Ordinance was published in the Gazette of the 7th June, and the Governor has reported that no adverse criticism has been made by the settlers or the public.

British Civil Servants in the Transvaal.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether in granting responsible Government to the Transvaal, any stipulation or arrangement was made with the incoming Government concerning the position of British civil servants who had done duty under the old Government; and if he can state how many resident magistrates and assistant resident magistrates have been summarily retrenched or removed from the service since the present Government came into power.

MR. CHURCHILL: The pension rights of officials transferred to the service of the Transvaal from pensionable service in this country or other Colonies were secured by legislation, but no general arrangement was made with regard to civil establishments, the regulation of which must, in accordance with established usage and the necessities of the case, rest with the Government which is responsible to the legislature of the Colony. I am aware that several magistrates have been retrenched lately, but I have not detailed information on the subject.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxvii., 1433.

Sir GILBERT PARKER reminded the right hon. Gentleman of the statement made by him when the Bill was introduced to the effect that every effort would be made to secure fair and equitable treatment for these officials from the Transvaal Government.

Mr. CHURCHILL said it was his desire to secure fair and equitable treatment everywhere, but His Majesty's Government could not interfere with the discretion of the Government of a self-governing Colony upon a matter falling exclusively under the control of that Government.

Sir GILBERT PARKER: But this statement was made preliminary to the grant of the responsible Government.

Isthmian Canal Labour.

Mr. STARKEY (Nottinghamshire, Newark): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies why no provision has been made in the Isthmian Canal Labour Contract for the repatriation of those Trinidad labourers who do not become destitute while working on the canal.

I beg also to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies why no provision is made under the Isthmian Canal Labour Contract for the Trinidad labourers to be accompanied by their wives and families.

Mr. CHURCHILL: There is an undoubted ambiguity in the contract upon the point noted by the hon. Member. The form of contract was drawn up not by the Trinidad Government but by the Isthmian Canal Commission, whose recruiting agent assured the Trinidad Government that the men would be repatriated at the expiration of their contract. I am informed that it has lately been held that the courts in the Canal Zone have no jurisdiction against the Isthmian Canal Commission for breach of contract. This contract therefore cannot be enforced. No recruiting has been carried on in Trinidad since November last. In answer to the second Question of the hon. Member I am informed that wives and families were not taken because none of the men applied to take them. The majority of the men were not natives of Trinidad, but had come there in search of work from other parts of the West Indies.

An HON. MEMBER asked the result of the inquiries promised to be made some time since.

Mr. CHURCHILL said he did not call to mind the promise, but would look into the matter.

Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): Has this contract been abrogated?

Mr. CHURCHILL: No, Sir.

Lord BALCARRES: In view of the fact it is impossible to enforce its terms will the right hon. Gentleman consider the desirability of abrogating it?

[No Answer was returned.]

East African Railways and Rupee Currency.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, by agreement with the India Office, branch railways might be built usefully in East Africa and Uganda from the profit made on the coinage and circulation of rupees; and whether he has any official Reports showing that the circulation of this rupee currency in vast regions in Africa, where to-day barter only obtains, would be calculated to develop local trade and commerce.

Mr. CHURCHILL: As the Governments of the African Protectorates do not share in the responsibility of the Government of India for maintaining the value of the rupee, the Secretary of State is not satisfied that the Government of India could properly be asked to hand over to Protectorates in which the Indian rupee circulates any portion of the funds by which the maintenance of its value is secured. The position does not appear to be altered by the fact that it has been decided to devote a portion of the profits on coinage to railway construction in India instead of investing the whole in home securities as has been done up to now. With regard to the latter part of the hon. Member's Question I am not aware of any special Reports dealing with this subject, but I have no doubt that the substitution of a proper currency for a system of barter would be calculated to develop trade and commerce.

Chinese Labour—Payment in Rupees.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the suggestion has been made to the Transvaal Government that native wages in the mines might be paid in rupees, or in the case of Chinese labour in silver dollars, such as are issued at the Straits mints; and whether an important economy in mine wages, without disadvantage to the wage earners, might result from the employment of one or other of these silver currencies in the place of the present sterling currency.

MR. CHURCHILL: No, Sir. I know nothing of such a suggestion.

Johannesburg Mines—Supply of Labour.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if the Committee appointed by the Transvaal Government to inquire into the whole question of the supply of labour for the mines at Johannesburg has now made its Report; and if the same can be supplied to this House.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Committee has not, as far as I am aware, yet reported.

MR. FELL: Was not the Committee appointed with a view to its reporting before any steps were taken with regard to Chinese labour?

MR. CHURCHILL: It was appointed by the responsible Government of the Colony, and it is not for us to interfere.

MR. FELL: But was not this one of the questions in regard to which His Majesty's Government retained the power of interference?

MR. CHURCHILL'S Answer was inaudible.

Turkish Customs Duties.

MR. LYNCH (Yorks, W.R., Ripon): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the fact that owing to the increase in the Turkish Customs duties granted by the Powers for a period of seven years, an annual sum estimated at from £450,000 to £500,000, and consisting of the best revenues of Turkey, will become available in two or three years for any purposes to which the Porte may desire to apply it, he will use his good offices with the Turkish Government as to the employment of these best revenues, thus to be set free, during the period for which the increase in the Customs has been granted.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir E. GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): I can add nothing to previous Answers which I have given on this subject.

MR. LYNCH: Arising out of that Answer, does the hon. Gentleman intend to acquiesce without protest to the applications of these large revenues—which have only been set free by our consent to the increase in the Customs on behalf of the wretched peasantry in Macedonia—to finding dividends for the German capitalists of the Baghdad Railway?

SIR E. GREY: I never said that I intended to acquiesce in anything.

Congo Free State Imports.

MR. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he is in a position to state to what extent goods are imported into the Congo Free State by way of the Nile; whether arms and ammunition are included in such consignments; and if so, whether the Egyptian Government have full information on the subject.

SIR E. GREY: I am not aware of the extent of trade in general merchandise; arms and ammunition are imported under the provisions of the Brussels Act which apply to such traffic; and the Egyptian and Soudanese authorities possess the requisite information.

Nile Bridge at Khartoum.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether a bridge over the Nile at Khartoum is to be constructed at a cost of £250,000; whether a contract for the construction has yet been given to any and what firm; and, if not, whether it may be tendered for by open competition.

SIR E. GREY: I will make inquiries.

Egyptian State Railways and Telegraphs.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the fact that in the Report of the Egyptian State Railways and Telegraphs for 1906 there is an entry of expenditure of £67,675 indicated solely as special and miscellaneous expenses, he will furnish the House with the items of the expenditure in question.

SIR E. GREY: Full details of the expenditure referred to are furnished on page 36 of the Report.

Egyptian Government Officials' Salaries.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that a number of inferior functionaries of the Egyptian Government have petitioned Sir Eldon Gorst to the effect that the cost of living in Egypt is constantly and rapidly increasing; that their salaries were fixed on the basis of the much lower costs of former years and are no longer sufficient for maintenance; and that the Commission appointed by Lord Cromer in 1904, by making the maximum of wages in the highest class from £5 to £9 per month, the maximum of which cannot be reached in less than fourteen years, has rendered their condition worse than formerly; and whether he will recommend the Egyptian Government to revise the scale.

SIR E. GREY: I am aware that this subject has been occupying the attention of the Egyptian Government. But I do not consider it advisable for his Majesty's Government to interfere in a matter which obviously depends upon detailed information of local conditions, with which the Egyptian Government are qualified to deal.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: And while a money grant is being made to Lord Cromer these men are to be kept on starvation wages.

Baghdad Railway.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can and will use his good offices to ensure that no portion of the £450,000 to £500,000 extra revenue which the Porte will receive in consequence of the increase of the Customs duties to which Britain was the consenting party most concerned, is used as a kilometric guarantee for the further prosecution of the Baghdad railway, unless and until the construction of the Gulf section is guaranteed to this country, together with a proper and preponderating influence in the whole Mesopotamian section.

SIR EDWARD GREY: As shown in the Papers recently presented to Parliament, the portion of the increased Customs duties which reverts to the Ottoman Government is earmarked for Macedonia.

Egyptian Postal Rates.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether in Egypt there is actually established a postage rate of 1d. (four milliėmes) for postcards for Great Britain, while the letter rate remains at 1¼d. (five milliėmes); and whether, in view of the increase in last year's postal revenue in Egypt, to which his attention has been called, he will now recommend the establishment of letter postage from Egypt to Great Britain at the rate of four milliėmes per unit of weight.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I will make further inquiries, but the matter is not one in which His Majesty's Government are called upon to interfere with the discretion of the Egyptian Government.

MR. HAROLD COX: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman if, before taking any action in the matter, he will inquire if the service is conducted at a profit?

Sir EDWARD GREY: I did not say I was going to take action.

Turkish Troops at Bemba.

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any official information showing that in the first week of June a detachment of fifty Turkish troops occupied Bemba, on the frontier of Tripoli, and that the Egyptian Government had charged on officer of the garrison of Alexandria to proceed to the spot with a detachment and cause it to be evacuated; and whether he can state what has since occurred.

Sir EDWARD GREY: The Answer to the first Question is in the affirmative. An officer went to investigate, and by 8th June was able to report that the Turkish patrol had left Egyptian territory.

Boutros Ghali Pasha.

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Boutros Ghali Pasha, the Egyptian Minister for Foreign Affairs, who was the president of the special tribunal which a year ago condemned the villagers of Denshawi, has been appointed to act as Regent of Egypt in the absence of His Highness the Khedive.

Sir EDWARD GREY: As Boutros Ghali Pasha was the senior Minister when His Highness the Khedive left Egypt, he was appointed, in accordance with precedent, to act as Regent.

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON asked whether the appointment would be reconsidered, in view of the position occupied by Boutros Ghali Pasha at the trial a year ago.

Sir EDWARD GREY: I did not see how the trial a year ago could in any way affect this appointment. The appointment is one that would have been made in the ordinary course, as Boutros Ghali Pasha is the senior Minister.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is this the person by whom the four villagers were brutally flogged?

Sir EDWARD GREY: The Answer is in the negative. The Question of the hon. Member can only be answered in the negative. It conveys imputations Boutros Ghali Pasha which are entirel undeserved.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Did the flogging occur or not? Is that the imputation?

*Mr. SPEAKER: That does not arise out of the Question.

Khedivial Law School—Case of M. Lambert.

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been called to allegations complaining that the recent forcing of the resignation of M. Lambert, by the action of Mr. Dunlop, from the presidency of the Khedivial Law School of Egypt, is part of a persistent policy of repression and discouragement of that school and of French instruction generally, in contravention of the friendly guarantee of French educational interests which was stipulated for in 1904; and whether it was also by the action of Mr. Dunlop that the Government École Normale, where there were many French professors, was closed, and that the teaching of French in the Government primary schools was abolished.

Sir EDWARD GREY: There is no truth whatever in the allegation that M. Lambert's resignation was forced. As I have previously stated, it was not desired at all. I have no information about the École Normale, but there is no intention whatever of not keeping the agreements of 1904 in the spirit and in the letter both in Egypt and elsewhere.

In reply to a further Question, Sir Edward Grey was understood to say that the point raised by M. Lambert was conceded to him rather than that he should resign.

The Hague Conference.

Mr. SAMUEL ROBERTS (Sheffield, Ecclesall): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if notice has been given by the British delegates at The Hague of any proposal for international limitation of armaments; and, if so, what are the terms of the resolution.

Sir EDWARD GREY: I see that the terms of a suggested resolution have appeared in the Press, but I understand that no resolution has yet been put formally before the Conference, and I cannot say what terms may eventually be proposed. It is desirable that they should be such as will be accepted by the Conference.

Kaid Maclean.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he has any official information showing any connection between the capture and holding for ransom of Kaid Maclean and the payment by this Government of the ransom for Mr. Abbott and by the Belgian Government for the Belgian subject captured recently.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Answer is in the negative. The trouble in this case is entirely between Raisuli and the Moorish Government.

Guaranteed Colonial Loans.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if there is any precedent for the guarantee by this country of a loan to any Colony where the proceeds of the loan are to be employed for the general purposes of that Colony and not for some extraordinary outlay.

MR. ASQUITH: It is not easy to draw the dividing line between ordinary and extraordinary expenditure. Many of the purposes for which loans have been guaranteed might be regarded as falling into either category.

Income-Tax on Irish Land Purchase.

MR. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether income-tax is demanded from occupiers of land in Ireland who have purchased their holdings under the Land Purchase Acts; whether such demand is also made from persons who have entered into agreements to purchase but whose purchase is not yet complete; whether at the same time income-tax is collected from the landlords on account of the interest payable to them under such agreements and from the former landlords on the income derived from the amount of the purchase money; and whether, seeing that under these circumstances double the amount of income-tax formerly collected from the land of Ireland is now claimed by the Inland Revenue, and that, in view of the long term of repayment, there is no material difference between annuity and rent, he will consider the advisability of putting a stop to these demands upon the occupying owners of farms in Ireland.

MR. ASQUITH: There is no double assessment on income derived from land in Ireland, the ordinary machinery of deduction provided by the Income-Tax Acts operating to prevent it. It may, however, be observed that occupiers of land in Ireland, who purchase their holdings under the Land Purchase Acts, will in the vast majority of cases be exempt from income-tax, as only a small percentage are likely to have total incomes exceeding £160 per annum.

Flogging in Prisons.

MR. LUTTRELL (Devonshire, Tavistock): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that in the local prisons in Scotland and Ireland there is no flogging sanctioned; and, if so, whether he would consider the advisability of the regulations in the local prisons in England being so altered as to prohibit this practice.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I beg to refer my hon. friend to the full Answer which I gave to the hon. Member for North Galway on the 7th May, 1906 †

Brooklands Motor Races.

MR. MARNHAM (Surrey, Chertsey): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been drawn to the danger and inconvenience run by the inhabitants of Weybridge from the influx of motor cars, including racing motors, into that village on days when races are held on Brooklands motor track; and whether he will seriously consider the advisability of issuing restrictions of such traffic on such race days through the village of Weybridge in accordance with Section 8 of The Motor Car Act, 1903.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxvi., 976–7.

Burns, Battersea): My attention has been drawn to this matter. I find that the Urban District Councils of Walton-on-Thames and Weybridge have written to the Surrey County Council with a view to an application being made to me for regulations relating to motor car traffic in their districts. I have not at present received an application from the county council, but I am in communication with them on the subject.

Mr. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): Have any steps been taken to regulate the traffic in the same neighbourhood on the tow-path between Kingston-on-Thames and Hampton Court Bridge?

Mr. JOHN BURNS said that an inquiry had been held, and as the result of the report which he had received on the subject he had decided to retain the riverside resort between Kingston Bridge and Hampton Court Palace for the use of the general public free from the inconvenience and discomfort that would arise there from motor car traffic.

Poor Law Children.

Mr. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can state the number of children in the Poor Law schools of England and Wales, and the number boarded-out within and without their respective unions on the 1st January, 1907.

Mr. JOHN BURNS: As I stated in reply to Questions put to me on the 15th and 16th April last, the number of children in district and separate schools on the 1st January, 1907, was 11,809, and in cottage, scattered, and other homes, 15,889. On the same day 6,806 children were boarded-out within the union, and 1,853 beyond the union.

Cost of Boarding-out Pauper Children.

Mr. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board what is the total inclusive cost per annum per child when boarded out under the Poor Law.

Mr. JOHN BURNS: The sums paid in respect of a child who is boarded-out vary according to the arrangement made with the foster-parent; but the amount paid for the maintenance of the child cannot exceed £13 a year. Some other payments are made for medical attendance, repair and renewal of clothing, schooling, etc. These seem usually to amount to between £2 and £3 a year.

Emigration Statistics.

Sir GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can state how many emigrants left this country for the United States, the Dominion of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa, respectively, from the 1st January to the 1st of July this year.

The SECRETARY to the BOARD of TRADE, (Mr. Kearley, Devonport): The usual monthly Return of "Passengers to and from places out of Europe" for June will be published in the course of a day or two and will give the hon. Member the particulars he requires.

Coal—Short Weight.

Mr. CLOUGH, (Yorkshire W.R., Skipton): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been drawn to the incorrect tare-weights of waggons used by certain colliery proprietors, which result in coal merchants being supplied with short weight of coal from these companies; and whether, in the interest of honest trading, he will promote legislation so to amend The Weights and Measures Act, 1889, as to secure the more frequent and correct taring of all railway trucks used in the wholesale coal trade.

Mr. KEARLEY: Yes, Sir, the attention of the Board of Trade has been called to this matter, and my hon. friend's suggestion will be borne in mind when any Amendment of the Weights and Measures Acts is in contemplation, but I fear that the Board of Trade cannot undertake to deal with the question at present.

Light Railway Commissioners.

Mr. CLOUGH: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade of whom do the Light Railway Commissioners consist; by whom are they appointed; what are their individual salaries and emoluments; and how many meetings are held annually.

Mr. KEARLEY: The Light Railway Commissioners are the Hon. A. E. Gathorne-Hardy (Chairman), who is unpaid (being also a Railway and Canal Commissioner), Colonel George F. Ottley Boughey, R.E., C.S.I., and Mr. Henry Allen Steward, Barrister-at-law. The Commissioners are appointed by the President of the Board of Trade. The two last-named Commissioners receive salaries of £1,000 per annum. The Commissioners are in permanent session at their offices, and the local inquiries held by them are only part of their duties.

Kirk Smeaton Bridge.

Mr. CLOUGH: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the Ackworth Light Railway Company agreed to construct a bridge, sixty-six feet in width, for carrying the Doncaster and Tadcaster main road, which forms part of the Great North Road, at Kirk Smeaton, and that the Light Railway Commissioners took the step of prescribing only for a width of fifty feet; and whether he proposes to take any steps to safeguard the public from such a policy being adopted in the future by the Light Railway Commissioners.

Mr. KEARLEY: The facts are as stated. In all such cases an appeal can be made from the Light Railway Commissioners to the Board of Trade, and such an appeal was duly made in this case. The Board, however, after full hearing and careful consideration, sustained the decision of the Commissioners. As the present width of metalled road at the place is only eighteen feet it was not considered reasonable to impose on a light railway the burden of a greater width at the proposed bridge than fifty feet.

Mr. CLOUGH: Did not the Light Railway Company agree to make the bridge the full width of the road?

Mr. KEARLEY: I am aware of that fact.

Telegraph and Telephone Accounts.

Mr. J. F. MASON: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he has now come to any decision as to improvement on the methods now in use for keeping the accounts of the telegraph and telephone departments.

Captain NORTON (Newington, W.; for Mr. Sydney Buxton): The undertaking that my right hon. friend gave on the Second Reading of the Telegraph (Money) Bill was that when he had a little leisure he would carefully examine the methods of presenting the telephone and telegraph accounts with a view to their improvement. This he proposes to do in the recess.

Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury when he will give particulars of the Supplementary Estimates to be presented this session.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury): I hope all these Estimates will be issued this week.

Giggleswick and Rathmell Charities.

Mr. CLOUGH: I beg to ask the hon. Member for the Elland Division, as representing the Charity Commissioners, whether the Commissioners have formulated a scheme for placing under one trust the charities of Clarke, Clapham, and others, in the parishes of Giggleswick and Rathmell, all the trustees of which shall be appointed by the parish council of Giggleswick and the parish meeting of Rathmell; and, if not, will he explain why this has not been done.

Mr. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): A scheme has been settled for the charities of the parishes of Giggleswick and Rathmell by which all the trustees will be appointed by the parish council of Giggleswick and the parish meeting of Rathmell. Clarke's charity, owing to difficulties connected with the governing body, has been omitted from the scheme. But the income of that charity only amounts to 28s. between the two parishes.

Small Holdings in Scotland.

Sir J. JARDINE (Roxburghshire): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Board has made any suggestions to the County Council of Roxburghshire as to holding inquiries about the demand for small holdings; whether any such inquiry has been made, and at what places; whether any reports have been submitted to the Board; and if he can state the names and occupations of the persons who held any such inquiries.

I beg also to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he can state what instructions or suggestions have been issued by the Board to the county councils of Scotland as regards commissions of inquiry into the demand and necessity for small holdings; and whether they include any recommendation for securing the presence of farm servants as members of any commissions of inquiry?

MR. LAIDLAW (Renfrewshire, E.): May I also ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the Board of Agriculture, whether he is able to say if the Board has issued any recommendations to the county council of Renfrewshire to hold inquiry regarding the demand for small holdings; and, if so, whether any recommendation has been made to secure the presence of one or more farm servants as members of any commission of inquiry that the council might appoint; and whether he can state if any public inquiry has yet been held in that county and a Report submitted to the Board?

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire): A circular letter was addressed by the Board in February last to all county councils in Great Britain calling attention to the Report of the Departmental Committee on Small Holdings, and in particular to the observations contained therein with respect to the present administration of the Small Holdings Act, 1892. The Committee recommended that an annual inquiry should be made by the Small Holdings Committee of a county council from the minor authorities within the county as to the land occupied by small holders, and as to whether there was a demand for further land for small holdings, and if any land was available for the purpose. The Board suggested that such an inquiry might with advantage be made forthwith. I understand that the county councils of Renfrew and Roxburgh are making inquiries on the lines suggested, but the results have not yet been communicated to the Board. I shall be glad to supply my hon. friends with copies of the Circular in question.

The Superior of Kelso.

SIR J. JARDINE: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether there is any official Return of the number and amounts of casualties collected in the last six years by the Duke of Roxburghe as Superior of Kelso, as compositions from his vassals in that burgh upon singular successions; and whether he can see his way to introduce a measure to confine the subject and amount of such casualties on singular successions to the land of the feu, buildings and other improvements thereon being excluded from the computation.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): So far as I am aware, there is no such official Return. The system which my hon. friend seeks to change has long been considered unsatisfactory and indefensible, but I am not able to give any undertaking to legislate upon it.

Birth Statistics.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the excess of births over deaths in England, Scotland, and Ireland per 1,000 of the population, from the latest available figures; and will he say if in any of the places mentioned a progressive decline is shown, whether it can be accounted for, and, if so, how; and whether any remedy has or is being applied.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): In the year 1906 the excess of births over deaths per 1,000 of the population was: in England and Wales, 11·6; in Scotland, 11·9; and in Ireland, 6·6. In the cases of England and Scotland the figures agree, as nearly as can be, with the average for the past ten years. In the case of Ireland the figures are a little more than one per 1,000 above the average for ten years. In none of the three countries, therefore, is a progressive decline shown in the excess of births over deaths.

Lunacy in Ireland.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the proportion per head of the population of lunatics in Ireland for the years 1851, 1881, and 1901; and will he say what is the relative proportion of males to females for the latter year, and in what respect, if any, this differs from the Returns of the same date in Great Britain.

MR. BIRRELL: In 1851, one out of every 1,291 persons in Ireland was recorded as a lunatic; in 1881, one out of 529; and in 1901, one out of 225. The proportion of male to female lunatics in Ireland in 1901 was 100 males to ninety-two females; in England, 100 males to 115 females; and in Scotland 100 males to 105 females.

Mentally Weak, and Deaf and Dumb.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the proportion per head of the population, from the latest available figures, of those suffering from mental derangement in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and also the figures on the same basis of the deaf and dumb in England, Scotland, and Ireland.

MR. BIRRELL: The proportion of persons suffering from mental derangement in the year 1901 was, in England, one in 245; in Scotland, one in 220; and in Ireland, one in 178. It must however be borne in mind that in England and Scotland the feeble-minded as well as lunatics and idiots are included, whereas the Irish figures comprise lunatics and idiots only. The proportion of deaf and dumb persons, according to the census of 1901, was, in England, one in 2,134; in Scotland, one in 1,695; and in Ireland, one in 1,450.

Swanlinbar Licensing Prosecution.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that Mr. M'Caffrey, J.P., interviewed Mr. Davies, district inspector, Royal Irish Constabulary, in the latter's house prior to adjudicating at petty sessions in Swanlinbar, county Cavan, on the 9th July, in a licensing prosecution against a Mrs. Prior; that this magistrate served forty-five years in the Royal Irish Constabulary; and that the district inspector was advised by him in this case, and immediately on the dismissal of the prosecution for breach of the Licensing Act, and at the instigation of Mr. M'Caffrey, Mr. Davies handed in a draft case stated prepared in anticipation of the result; whether in view of this magistrate's connection with the police force and the desirableness of securing the confidence of the people in the impartiality of the administration of justice in the county, this matter will have the attention of the authorities; and what steps, if any, is it proposed to take.

MR. BIRRELL: The Inspector-General informs me that on the occasion in question Mr. M'Caffrey, J.P., who is a retired officer of the Royal Irish Constabulary, called to see District-Inspector Davies on private business. The District-Inspector states that there is absolutely no foundation for the suggestion that Mr. M'Caffrey advised him in respect of the prosecution referred to, or instigated him to apply for a case stated. No draft of the case to be stated was prepared beforehand. It is the duty of the magistrates, and not of the police, to prepare a case for the opinion of the Superior Courts. Having regard to the facts, there does not appear to be any ground for taking action in the matter.

Irish Teachers Salaries.

MR. MOONEY (Newry): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware of the fact that the ordinary salary payable under the existing rules by the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland works inequitably in the cases of five teachers who entered the service of the Board from the 1st April, 1900, to 31st December, 1900, and are in charge of schools with an average under sixty; whether he is aware that the Commissioners have stated that the ordinary salary will not work inequitably in the case of ten teachers who entered the service in the same year and are in charge of schools with an average of over sixty; and whether he can state what explanation the Commissioners give with reference to the facts set out as regards these five teachers.

MR. BIRRELL: I have referred this Question to the Commissioners of National Education, who inform me that the Question is too vague to admit of a definite Answer. If the hon. Member will give particulars of the cases to which he refers in the first part of the Question I will again refer the matter to the Commissioners.

MR. MOONEY: If I give the names will the right hon. Gentleman undertake that the Commission of National Education shall not take any action against them? Will he ask the Commissioners to make further inquiry?

MR. BIRRELL: I do not think that kind of communication would have the effect the hon. Member has in view.

Irish Evicted Holdings.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what was the aggregate area of the evicted holdings formerly occupied by the 1,609 tenants or tenants' representatives mentioned in Paragraph 22 of the special Report of the Estates Commissioners [Cd. 3570], and who should, in the opinion of the Commissioners, be reinstated or provided with new holdings.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that the information asked for in the Question could only be obtained by an examination of the applications in each individual case, and that such an examination would involve the expenditure of much time and labour on the part of their staff. Having regard to the existing pressure upon the Commissioners and their staff, I do not think it reasonable to ask them to undertake the required investigation.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman furnish the information with regard to the cases he has actually before him?

MR. BIRRELL: I think even that would involve an amount of time and labour which, in view of the pressure under which the officials are working, I should not feel justified in imposing on them.

Lords and Commons.

*CAPTAIN FABER: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he can give an assurance that the Bill to be introduced next session to modify the relations between the two Houses of Parliament shall have precedence over all other measures.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): No Sir, I have nothing to say on this subject.

Infantile Mortality.

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the death-rate amongst young children from burning and overlaying, he will afford facilities for the passage into law of the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Bill during the present session.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The time has not yet come for deciding on the Bills claiming to have facilities given to them. I believe this Bill has not even been read a second time.

Parliament and India.

SIR J. JARDINE: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, on consideration of the many social and moral changes going on in India and the vastness of the political, financial, and commercial interests concerned, he can see his way to assigning more time for the discussion of Indian affairs in this House.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The House is undoubtedly concerned with political, financial, and commercial interests in India, but I am afraid no further time can be given this session for the subject, and I am afraid that no amount of time would be sufficient if the House sought to control the complex and delicate elements of social and moral changes to which my hon. friend alludes.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.) asked whether the one day given this session was adequate for a fair discharge of the grave responsibility of the House in the government of India.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: A better opportunity has been given this year than in many years when we never heard of India till the expiring days of the session. Hon. Members have many opportunities for bringing forward Indian matters.

SIR H. COTTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman give further facilities for debate?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No Sir.

THE "VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS."

MR. MOONEY (Newry) drew the attention of the Speaker to the fact that an Amendment to the Evicted Tenants Bill moved in Committee the night before by the Member for North Dublin, and carried, did not appear in the Votes and Proceedings circulated that morning, although other Amendments were noticed. He asked whether the Votes and Proceedings were an official record of the proceedings of the House, or whether any other record was kept, and, if so, whether there was any way in which an ordinary Member could ascertain the actual proceedings of the House.

*MR. SPEAKER said the Votes and Proceedings were only a brief abstract and chronicle of what took place. A fuller account would be found in the Journal. The real authority, however, as to the Amendments was the Bill itself. If the hon. Member would look at the Bill itself, which was amended by the Chairman of Committee as the Committee stage progressed, he would find the Amendments made by him in the Bill itself, which always lay on the Table.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) asked what was the use of issuing the Votes and Proceedings if they were not a trustworthy account of what took place. It was not a summarised account; it was a defective record calculated to deceive Members of the House. Could not some change be made in this matter which would enable hon. Members to find out what had taken place without examining the Bill on the Table?

*MR. SPEAKER said the Votes and Proceedings recorded cases in which the closure was moved or refused, and in which a division took place on an Amendment, but they did not record all the Amendments proposed or the fate of those Amendments. The present practice was of very old standing, and he was not prepared to say at a moment's notice that it ought to be changed; but he would consider the suggestion of the hon. Member for Waterford.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.) asked if it were not the fact that all the Amendments dealt with on the previous night were mentioned except this particular one. Was that omitted by design or by accident?

*MR. SPEAKER said it was omitted by design, because the Amendment was accepted.

MR. MOORE: But the following Amendment, which was also agreed to, appears.

*MR. SPEAKER: Yes, because a colleague of the hon. Member moved the closure on it and it became necessary to record that abortive proceeding, and in order to show what happened to the Amendment it had to be put in the Votes. It could not to be left in the air as it were.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) wished to make an appeal to the Prime Minister on his decision in connection with the order of Votes to be taken on Thursday in Irish Supply. Last year there was no opportunity of discussing the Chief Secretary's Vote, except on one evening after eight o'clock, and he understood that the idea of the Government was that this procedure should be repeated. Regarding the Chief Secretary's Vote as a proper occasion for a general survey of Irish administration, and taking into account the condition of Ireland and the desire of the Unionist Party for discussion, he asked whether the right hon. Gentleman did not think it would be in accordance with the spirit of the Supply rule that an adequate opportunity for discussion should be given.

MR. JOHN REDMOND asked whether it was not a fact that the Leader of the Opposition when in office initiated the practice of acting according to the wishes of the Irish Party in the selection of Irish Supply; whether the practice was not broken for the first time last year; and whether there was not a clear understanding that the Irish Party should name the Supply for the third day this year.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR asked whether the practice to which the hon. and learned Gentleman had referred was not based on the fact that at the time when it was initiated the hon. Gentlemen below the gangway were the only opposition to the Government coming from Ireland. The essence of Supply was that the critics of the Government should have the first turn, and he thought the Opposition above the gangway, including the Ulster Members, ought to be treated as all other critics were treated, and allowed a legitimate opportunity of stating their case.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): Have not the regular Opposition the right to demand a day for a Vote of Censure, which demand would not be acceded to if it came from this quarter of the House ?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am willing to accept the alternative and waive the right to discuss the Chief Secretary's Vote next Thursday if the right hon. Gentleman will give us a day for discussing it on a Vote of Censure.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not suppose that is a serious suggestion.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Perfectly serious.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN expressed the opinion that these were hardly the conditions and circumstances which belonged to an ordinary notice of a vote of censure. At the same time, he appreciated the force of the consideration *tantas componere lites.* He had heard with astonishment the suggestion that criticisms of the late Government came entirely from the Nationalists. He thought the Member for Dover resigned the Chief Secretaryship mainly in consequence of criticisms from his own side.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is a complete mis-statement, and I think the right hon. Gentleman must know it.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I gave the general impression made on the public mind, and remaining on the public mind.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): Also on the mind of the Member for Dover.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said that for many years the distribution of Irish Votes in Supply had been practically left to the option of Members below the gangway, and the practice was being stretched a little further in the direction of recognising other sections of Irish Members by allowing a partition of the night. It was intended that the Chief Secretary's Vote should, as last year, be taken after eight o'clock. He did not think that, that opportunity being given in addition to all the other opportunities open to Members of bringing forward subjects in which they were interested, any reasonable complaint could be made by hon. Members below the gangway.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich) said he had heard alarming reports about discharges from the Arsenal, and he pressed for an opportunity to discuss the matter on the Army Estimates.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) submitted to the Prime Minister that it was not unreasonable that the Unionist Members from Ireland, who represented one-third of the country, should have one of the remaining days allotted to Supply.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said he had recognised the claims of the Ulster Members, and had gone much further towards meeting them than had been done formerly. In answer to his hon friend the Member for Woolwich, he was unable to give another day to the War Office Vote. In regard to Friday's business, he should move at the beginning of the proceedings the suspension of the eleven o'clock rule and the five o'clock rule for the rest of the session—the usual Motion suspending the Standing Order relating to the sittings of the House; and make such a statement—which might not be a very serious matter—as business required. Afterwards, by way of soothing effect, he proposed to proceed with the Butter and Margarine Bill.

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe) asked if they could have time to discuss the War Office Vote and to criticise the Local Government Board? Under Standing Orders the Government had power to allot three additional days to Supply if it chose.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN replied that he was afraid he could not give any additional days. He was afraid that when he came to make his statement it would be found that the session would not be a very short one as it was.

PROCEDURE (ANTICIPATORY MOTIONS).

Report from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence and an Appendix, brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 264.]

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

Albert Victor Grayson, esquire, for the Southern Part of the West Riding of the County of York (Colne Valley Division).

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Third Report brought up, and read, with Minutes of Evidence.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 265.]

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C (added in respect of the Small Holding and Allotments Bill): Mr. Nicholls; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. George Hardy.

Report to lie upon the Table.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee).

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

MR. STAVELEY-HILL (Staffordshire, Kingswinford) moved an Amendment to provide that the evicted tenants who received the benefits of the Bill should be domiciled in Ireland. It seemed to him, and he trusted it would also be the opinion of the Government, that the advantages of the Bill should be given only to those tenants who had remained in Ireland and not also to those who had emigrated. As the Committee were aware, a great number of the tenants evicted in other days had left the country for nobody's benefit but their own. They had sought their fortunes in Australia, America, and other countries, and should not now have the advantage of this Bill. The British taxpayers had to be considered, and it was not fair that their money should be used to reinstate men who had emigrated and had only returned when they heard the evicted tenants were to be restored to their holdings. He begged to move.

Mr. Shackleton.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 19, after the word 'holdings,' to insert the words 'and who, at the time of application, were domiciled in Ireland.'"—(*Mr. Staveley-Hill.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.) said it had not been the intention of the Commissioners that persons who could be shown to be actually domiciled in the United States should be allowed to avail themselves of the benefit of the Bill, but whether it would be a desirable thing to exclude finally and in every case persons whose domicile was not in Ireland was a matter about which there might be considerable difference of opinion. The Amendment as it stood would not be reasonable, because it required a purely Irish domicile. There might be circumstances in which it would be very difficult and expensive to determine where a person was domiciled, and it might be held that persons had for the purposes of this Act an English and not an Irish domicile. If there had been any likelihood that the powers of the Act would be used in favour of persons who had abandoned Ireland, it might have been desirable to insert words excluding them, but no such question, he thought, arose. The Commissioners had acted on the principle that a person who had abandoned Ireland altogether was not to benefit, but to exclude them in the manner proposed might give rise to legal proceedings which would add to the delay and to the costs which were borne by the Treasury. Therefore, while agreeing with the hon. Member as to the rule to be obeyed, he doubted the wisdom of inserting his Amendment.

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.) thought the Amendment a very important one as illustrating the attitude of the right hon. Gentleman. In spite of all his assurances that many of the Amendments proposed were reasonable and should be considered, he had hitherto declined to accept any suggestion which would alter a line of the Bill. He suggested that the Chief Secretary should get leave from those with whom he had conferred since the introduction of the Bill to make an alteration of this sort. Perhaps the word "domicile" was not fortunately chosen. Could not the right hon. Gentleman accept an Amendment excluding aliens from the Bill?

MR. BIRRELL: No alien will get the benefit of this measure.

MR. MOORE asked why, if no alien would get the benefit of the measure, they should not put it in the Bill? The Amendment was another result of the secrecy which the right hon. Gentleman had maintained with regard to the findings of the Estates Commissioners. If the names of the 2,000 persons whom the Estates Commissioners had found eligible for reinstatement were published, the Committee would be in a position to know how many of them were aliens. The right hon. Gentleman had refused to give that information, but said that no alien was to get the benefit of the Bill. Would the right hon. Gentleman carry his sweet reasonableness so far as to insert an Amendment which would prevent the alien from getting the security of British credit? At present, all over the country there were reports of people hastening from America in order to get 40 acres in Ireland. If it were a question of English or Scottish domicile, he was sure his hon. friend would raise no objection. The real objection was to the return of the Irish-American, and he had no hesitation in saying that for those responsible for the good government and peace of Ireland the returned Irish-American was in nine cases out of ten the most undesirable person they could have. He had left America because he was a failure there, and he came back tempted by the magnificent offer of 40 acres and £200 or £250 to stock his farm. There was no check on the Commissioners, no one knew what they had done in the secrecy of their chamber, and it would be impossible to see that a returned Irish-American had been reinstated until the man was actually on the holding. It would be very unfortunate if a class of persons who had left the United States should come back to Ireland to be endowed with British money. That would be a very undesirable state of affairs, and the Amendment afforded a very good test of how far the right hon. Gentleman would meet them and whether he was prepared to put in his Bill a clause excluding aliens.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) said the hon. and learned Member was alarming himself needlessly. The average Irish-American was not likely to leave his employment in America to come back to Ireland for a farm of 40 acres, under the present depressed agricultural conditions. The number of Irish-Americans who would come must be very few, perhaps not more than half a dozen, if as many, and there was no necessity for an Amendment like that proposed. It might very well be that tenants who had been evicted because they were unable to pay the rack-rents charged by the landlords had come to this country or Scotland, where they performed the hardest kind of work in the mines and the factories for very low wages. Why should these men be debarred from being reinstated in their old homes? The Amendment—he had almost raised it as a point of order—would, he submitted, practically repeal Section 2 of the Act of 1903, of which the measure now before the House was complementary, save as regarded powers of compulsion. Section 2 referred to tenants or their representatives, and he believed that the Amendment would repeal that section, and was, therefore, out of order. On the whole matter as it stood the hon. Member who moved the Amendment was only putting up a case in order to knock it down again. The word "domicile" could apply to very few persons at the most, while the Amendment would also apply to those who had been driven to seek work in England and Scotland. Nor did he see why the Irish-American should be excluded, for after all the Irish-Americans had done more to uplift Ireland than the landlord class had ever done. They had sent millions of money home with a generosity which had been the subject of remark over and over again by Mr. Bright, Mr. Gladstone, and others, to keep up the old homes and to help to pay rack-rents to the landlords who were represented in that House.

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL (Dublin University) said he quite agreed that the word "domicile" might give rise to the legal difficulties which the right hon. Gentleman had mentioned, and he saw no reason why men who happened to be employed in England or Scotland should be excluded. He could understand the right hon. Gentleman's point of view that they might trust the discretion of the Commissioners not to put in an unsuitable person or an Irish-American; at the same time that discretion was not infallible; and he had, therefore, a suggestion to offer the right hon. Gentleman which was contained in an Amendment to Clause 2, to the effect that the particulars taken by the Commissioners should set forth in full the name and present address and occupation of the person or persons whom it was proposed to restore. That would give to the landlord or any other person the fullest opportunity of informing the Estates Commissioners of the absence from Ireland or other objections to the person intended to be reinstated. He thought that would meet the object which his hon. friend had in view.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) aid he rather hoped the Government would accept the Amendment of his hon. friend, either in the form in which it was moved or without the word "domicile," which would get rid of the legal difficulty of which the Chief Secretary had spoken. He thought the Amendment was a test of the true object of the Bill. As he understood, the case presented was this. Here was a class of men who, rightly or wrongly, believed they were suffering from an injustice; they were centres of disturbance in Ireland and made it difficult to restore order and good-will in that country. That case could not apply to anyone who was not resident in Ireland; and it could only apply to people who from that point of view had to be restored to their holdings, and were feeling this injustice of which so much complaint was made. The Amendment would be a test of whether the Government accepted the view of the hon. Member who had spoken just now, that the Bill was a reward for those who had assisted him and his friends in the campaign against the landlords of Ireland; or whether the object of the Bill was to restore law and order, and peace, and good-will in Ireland, in which case the Government would accept the Amendment.

Mr. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.) said that from the point of view of the Nationalist Party this was a very extraordinary Amendment. He knew that a man was coming back from New Zealand at the present moment with a view to obtaining possession of a farm from which he had been evicted. He also knew of a man who was coming back from America to get back to the farm from which he had been evicted. It would be an outrage to prevent these men from being reinstated in their holdings. These and other men had left their country to seek their living abroad because they were unable to pay the rack-rents demanded by the landlords in Ireland, and were they, for that reason, to be prevented from coming back to their native land to get possession of the farms from which they had been unjustly evicted? It was an outrage on the Imperial Parliament to put before the Committee such an Amendment, the only effect of which would be unjustly to exclude these poor exiled Irishmen from being reinstated in their former holdings.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) said he was glad they had had an opportunity of listening to the two speeches of hon. Members below the gangway, for they threw a light upon the designs and desires of Nationalist Members in a way which he had thought impossible before the Amendment was moved. The Bill must have been introduced for one of two purposes—either for the purpose of dealing with the evicted tenants who, as was said, had been centres of disturbance, and, as was agreed under the Act of 1903, were to be restored to their holdings; or, as they had learned, it was meant practically to reward every man who for the last twenty-five years, for one reason or another, had lost his farm. If some limitation such as was proposed by the Amendment were not introduced into the Bill there would be endless trouble in connection with aliens from America coming to Ireland to get the benefit of the Act. The Irish-American was very much in evidence in Ireland at the present day. He (Mr. Craig) was in Connemara at Easter, and a local doctor told him that it was a peculiar thing to hear children going about Connemara with a strong American accent. Under the Bill they were likely to have a perfect flood of Irish-Americans. Some of them would probably come over to Ireland, get a 40-acre farm, and sell it again to his neighbour and return to America. From such a possibility they required protection. He was hopeful that the Chief Secretary would accept this or some similar Amendment, because for the first time since the Committee stage commenced the right hon. Gentleman had admitted that there was a considerable amount of reason or justice in the objection raised; and he was quite sure that his hon. and learned friend did not wish that evicted tenants who had emigrated to other parts of the British Islands should be excluded from the Bill. It was not against those persons that the Amendment was directed, but against men from America, who would seize the opportunity to come over to get hold of some of these farms. He hoped the Chief Secretary would either accept this Amendment in an amended form or else introduce some other words upon the Report stage to deal with this very important point.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.) said he desired to put a typical case. He knew an instance where, ten years ago, through the harsh treatment of the landlord because he was unable to pay an exorbitant rent a man was evicted. What was the procedure? The landlord, using his influence through the Local Government Board, followed that evicted tenant into the workhouse and was the means of getting the 3s. or 4s. a week he was receiving as outdoor relief stopped. Under this Amendment that poor man would be excluded from any benefits under the Bill. There was a general understanding when the Act of 1903 was passed that every evicted tenant, no matter what were the conditions under which he was evicted, for a period of twenty-five years previous to the passing of that Act, would be entitled to make an application to the Estates Commissioners. He hoped the Chief Secretary would not consent to make any exception in regard to these unfortunate men who had been driven out of their own country. The Amendment would not ease the situation, and he hoped that every tenant who had been evicted unjustly and had gone abroad would have the same rights as the evicted tenants living in Ireland.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said that, having regard to the revelations which had just been made in respect to people from the United States and elsewhere returning in view of the present Bill to to take up land under the new provision, some such Amendment as had been proposed seemed to be an absolute necessity. They were informed that two persons were known to be coming from long distances to be reinstated. He had to remind the Chief Secretary that from those benches below the gangway they were last night given the names and conditions in life of certain evicted tenants. He could hardly believe that these returning wanderers were taking these journeys on the off-chance of the Estates Commissioners giving them holdings. It was now, therefore, perfectly clear that the Estates Commissioners had already expressed an intention to restore these two returning people—one from New Zealand and the other from the United States. Through some channel news of that intention must have reached these people. The suggestion which he had already made would not meet this case, for he understood that the Estates Commissioners would be the last men who would put the law in force for the purpose of benefiting men of that kind. He would remind the Chief Secretary that though his intentions on this subject might be of the very best, he had not expressed them in the Bill, and outside the Bill they would be utterly useless, for the right hon. Gentleman's power over it ceased as soon as it became law. Although the Chief Secretary's view of the suggestion contained in the Amendment was that it was desirable, he would not put it into the Bill. For the life of him he could not comprehend that attitude. He would therefore support the Amendment of his hon. friend providing for the limitation of residence to the United Kingdom.

MR. BIRRELL said they were discussing a limited clause, affecting only those persons who had been evicted up to a certain date, and who had been required to give proper notice. The right hon. and learned Gentleman would have the Committee believe that the American liners were coming over to Ireland crowded with persons anxious to claim the benefits of the Bill. What was the good of talking at large in that fashion? The Bill was a very limited measure, and he was not dealing with people who might be dissatisfied because they had not been included. The right hon. Member for Dublin University thought the Bill was big enough already, and he did not want to enlarge its boundaries so as to include everybody in America who might hear of it and say, "Hallo! I am an evicted tenant; I will go back to Ireland and get a farm and 200 acres, and get restored to the home of my father." That could not be done under the provisions of the Bill. To be entitled to benefit a person must already have made his case good, produced his credentials, and submitted his name and all the circumstances of his case to the Estates Commissioners, who must have inquired into the matter on the spot; but because that person might happen to be in America the right hon. and learned Member contended that he should absolutely and ruthlessly be excluded. They were only discussing about half-a-dozen cases out of 2,000, and it was these half-a-dozen rampant American-Irishmen whom the right hon. Gentleman in his new-born zeal for the purity of the Irish breed was desirous of excluding from the Bill. The matter was really not worth talking about. Those Irishmen who had gone to America were not in the least likely to come back to Ireland for the privilege of getting a 30-acre farm. As a rule, if such men came back to Ireland they were generally in a sufficiently independent position not to require the advantages placed at their disposal by the Bill. It was disheartening to see so much time occupied in discussing a question which had no force or moment in relation to this question. The overwhelming majority—in fact, he might say the whole of them with the exception of about a dozen at the outside—would be resident Irish tenants. He did not wish to do an injustice even in half-a-dozen cases. The discussion was simply a quibble in which he was asked to insert words which might in one or two cases hamper the cause of justice, and he was not disposed to do anything of the kind. They were told that there was an atmosphere of suspicion about these transactions, and that he was engaged in all kinds of underhand dealings, sometimes with hon. Members below the gangway, and sometimes with people in a far-off part of the world. The hon. Member for North Armagh might use such language to him, but he had entered into a solemn obligation with himself that he would not lose his temper even with that hon. Member. He supposed that the language the hon. Member had employed was his notion of conciliation, but to him it was hard to distinguish it from the language of insult. He knew that people had their own way of conducting their cases—it was a habit of the Court. He was not going to give it greater importance than it deserved. All he could say was that there was nothing of the kind; he had no secrets to keep from anybody; nor had the Estates Commissioners informed anybody, except in some cases the tenants themselves, that their cases had been investigated, and that they had passed the ordeal, and might look forward to being reinstated under the provisions of the Bill, or upon untenanted land under the general provisions of the Land Acts of Ireland. There was no harm in telling tenants, or in a tenant telling his friends. Of course, some information of this kind naturally got abroad. He was not going any further into the matter. He was unable to accept the Amendment.

MR. MEYSEY-THOMPSON (Staffordshire, Handsworth) said that if there were only one or two persons coming from abroad to claim reinstatement on farms from which they or their relatives had been evicted it would not matter, but there might be a large number, and it was on that point that the supporters of the Amendment took their stand. They could not see how the congested districts in Ireland would be relieved if a large number of the descendants of evicted tenants came back to occupy evicted farms. It was a very important question whether the descendants of evicted tenants were to be imported in large numbers from America and the Colonies to dispossess those now in occupation of the farms.

MR. MOORE said he was sorry the Chief Secretary had run away after making personal charges against him, but he would take that opportunity of saying that he should ignore those personal charges.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange): The Chief Secretary has been called away suddenly for important business with the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

MR. MOORE said that if the Chief Secretary repeated those charges he should take no notice of them, and they would not prevent him from doing his duty. The right hon. Gentleman was himself to blame for any atmosphere of suspicion which had been created. Nationalist Members were in possession of information upon certain points on which information was denied to Unionists. He and his friends had again and again asked for the names of the people who had been selected by the Estates Commissioners, and that information had been denied to them. They had been for the first time told by the Chief Secretary that the fortunate parties had been communicated with. People whose lands were to be taken from them had a right to know who they were, and they could not get that information. If there had been suspicion engendered, it was the result of the intimate relations existing between Nationalist Members and the Chief Secretary, and of the right hon. Gentleman's refusal to take Unionist Members into his confidence on matters vital to the Bill. He regretted that the Minister responsible for the management of Irish business in that House had treated one-third of the representatives of Ireland in such a manner. It was most regrettable. They had a right to know what was to be done with regard to the legislation of the country. But that was the one thing the Chief Secretary kept from them, and then complained that they were suspicious. The right hon. Gentleman had tried to impress upon members of the Committee that this was a limited Bill. He thought the Committee were agreed that it ought to be a limited Bill. But the Chief Secretary had consistently and determinedly opposed every effort made by Unionists to limit it. He had refused to accept any limit as to the number of tenants, as to the acreage of land which could be compulsorily taken, and also as to the price that the British taxpayer was to pay. Now that a limitation was proposed as to the quality of the tenant who was to be eligible for the benefits of the Bill, what did the Chief Secretary do? He got up and made speech No. 1, in which he said that it was obviously never intended to give aliens the benefit of the Bill. Then he got up and made speech No. 2, after hon. Gentlemen below the gangway had threatened him as to what would happen if aliens were excluded. Then the right hon. Gentleman stated that he would not make any alteration in the Bill which would lead to injustice, even to five or six persons who might be coming from abroad. It would be an injustice to British taxpayers that a naturalised American citizen should come over and get the benefit of British credit at the expense of law-abiding tenants who had signed purchase agreements, for which the Chief Secretary had not yet found the money in order that they might be completed. The right hon. Gentleman had treated as a nightmare on the part of the Unionist Members from Ireland the idea that an American might come across the Atlantic and request the Estates Commissioners to give him his due, and then sell the holding. This view had already been taken, because Section 8 of the Bill provided that where a tenant was reinstated in a holding he was not to be allowed to transfer it without the consent of the Land Commission. That would not prevent an American from coming back, getting the holding, and selling it next day. Hon. Members below the gangway said that that was reasonable. That clause was put in to prevent the transference of a farm when a man came back from America. That man would not only get the farm, but the report of the Estates Commissioners said that he was entitled to an adequate sum of money as well. He would get £250 or £300 in the shape of chattels, stock, cattle and machinery, and there was nothing in the Bill to prevent him calling an auction and selling out and recrossing the Atlantic. He could get a steerage for £4 or £5, and having got £300 for the stock he would be able to return to America with £296 of the British taxpayers' money. That was not only possible but probable, and it was to prevent an operation of that sort that the right hon. Gentleman said he would put nothing in the Bill which would lead to injustice. There were plenty of people in this country who had a first claim on public funds.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone) said the discussion had been useful in one sense, namely, in throwing light on how the vast number of 8,000 had come to be compiled. He hoped that on the Report stage there might be words put in which would cover the Amendment moved by his hon. friend. It was obvious that some sort of limitation was required. At present there was no limitation as to the relationship of the person who might be allowed to obtain a farm. They had heard of aliens on their way to this country to apply for reinstatement, but they had had no opportunity of knowing anything of the other 8,000. He did not see that there was any guarantee that foreigners coming from abroad would not be able to take up farms from which evicted peaceful and law-abiding citizens were to be evicted. He had a certain amount of sympathy with one section of evicted tenants who were to be reinstated at the expense of the British taxpayers. He referred to those who were persuaded by hon. Gentlemen below the gangway and their predecessors to break the law and to decline to pay their rents. It was on account of that action that the great bulk of the evicted tenants had been brought into the position in which they were at the present moment. If the words of his hon. friend's Amendment were not accepted, he sincerely hoped that some words would be introduced for the purpose of limiting the Bill to that class of evicted tenants.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 75; Noes, 303. (Division List No. 299.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur

Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hervey, F. W. F. (BuryS. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon-Slaney ,Rt.Hon.Col.W.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Liddell, Henry
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm.G. (Petersfield)
O'Neill Hon. Robert Torrens
Pease,HerbertPike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Roberts,S.(Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley,Hon.Arthur (Ormskirk)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E .(Kent, Mid.)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Staveley - Hill and Mr. Meysey-Thompson.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Akdins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith,Rt.Hon.HerbertHenry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, HerbertJ.(Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur(Edinburgh,S.)
Dewar,SirJ.A.(Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson,W.H. (St.Pancras,N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner,Col.Alan(Hereford,S.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gurdon,Rt.Hn.SirW.Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hove,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.)
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R, C.
Lever,A.Levy(Essex,Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lloyd, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh,Jeremiah(Down,S.)
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.

M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield,H.Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan,J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morse, L. L.
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles.A(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willians
O'Brien,Kendal (TipperaryMid.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps,J.Wynford(Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price,RobertJohn(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,T.F.(Wolverhampton
Richardson, A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward(Salisbury)
Thomas, SirA.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thorne, William
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Ward,W.Dudley (Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E(Clackmannan)
Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh., N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, JamesHenry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London), on behalf of the right hon. Member for Dublin University, moved an Amendment, to provide that the Commissioners should hold a public hearing of all parties interested before determining that the evicted tenants to be reinstated were fit and proper persons to be become purchasers under the Land Purchase Acts. It appeared to him to be a reasonable Amendment, and it was to be hoped the right hon. Gentleman would do more than give a courtesy reception to it. It was evidently in the true interests of the Bill and of the Commissioners, and was likely to make the proceedings under the Bill more harmonious. How were they to ascertain whether an applicant was a fit and proper person to be reinstated unless they inserted the proposed words and provided for an investigation into the circumstances connected with his claim? There had been recriminations about secrecy, but he was quite certain the right hon. Gentleman did not wish to perpetuate secrecy, and he was sure that hon. Members below the gangway desired that the proceedings should be conducted in the most open and above-board manner. Every taxpayer had a right to know what was going on. It was the first essential of a Court of Justice that all the parties interested should be heard, and in a case of this sort it was absolutely necessary that all the parties who would should come forward and give their testimony as to whether the claims were good or not, and whether the applicants were fit and proper persons to become purchasers under the Act. He did not suppose there would be a Report stage, as no Amendment had been accepted.

MR. CHERRY said that two Amendments had been accepted, so there would be a Report stage.

SIR F. BANBURY said he was glad to hear that, but he begged to move the Amendment.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) raised, as a point of order, the question whether the Amendment would not be more properly dealt with on Subsection (5) of Clause 2, which enacted the machinery of the Bill. The whole of Section 2 seemed to him to deal with the procedure question, while Section 1 dealt with the question of principle.

SIR F. BANBURY thought the Amendment was in its proper place. There were two stages. The first was that an application should be made, and that then the Commissioners should consider whether the applicants were fit and proper persons. Before they considered whether applicants were fit and proper persons they must take into consideration whether the applications had been properly lodged.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL pointed out that the inquiry upon which the Commissioners were to say that the applicants were fit and proper persons preceded that publication of the notice under Section 2, and therefore this was the only place in which the Amendment of his hon. friend could come in. It would no doubt be out of order unless it was intended to portend a second inquiry.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that in reference to the point of order it was sometimes an extremely difficult matter to decide whether an Amendment should be accepted to a first clause of this character, or on the machinery clause, and his decision on this point was that this was a condition precedent which might properly be moved on this clause, and therefore he should allow it to be moved.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 19, after the word 'Commissioners' to insert the words 'after a public hearing of all parties interested.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. CHERRY wished, in the first place, most cordially to thank the hon. Baronet for the courteous manner in which he had moved his Amendment. It was quite refreshing to him to hear an Amendment proposed without a single taunt being levelled at the Irish Government, or any charge that they had been guilty of underhand conduct. He did not know whether the rest of the debate would be conducted in this way, but he sincerely hoped it would. As to the Amendment, he was very sorry that the right hon. Member for Dublin University, in whose name it stood, should have given notice of it, especially as he was not present that day, because he did not think he could have realised what its effect would be. The right hon. Gentleman wanted to have a public hearing of all the parties interested, the tenant, the landlord, the mortgagee and others in the locality who had any claims upon the land. Taking the proposal and dealing with it in point of time, hon. Members knew how long these matters took now, and if each of these claims was heard in a public inquiry, with counsel and King's Counsel—they knew what long speeches they could make—he calculated that a reasonable computation would be that half a day would be taken for each case.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.): Two days.

MR. CHERRY said he would not take it at two days, but at half a day a case. There were said to be 8,000 cases, and that would mean 4,000 days. Supposing all the Commissioners were to give their whole time to this task he did not think they could expect them to sit more than 300 days in the year.

Sir F. BANBURY said, as he understood it, the 8,000 were largely composed of applictions of a fictitious character, and if there was a public inquiry most of these claims would drop out.

Mr. CHERRY thought that the bogus claims would remain, and it was always the bogus claims that took the most time. There were 4,000 days, and he calculated taking 300 working days a year that it would take thirteen years and four months to investigate them. Putting aside the question of time and taking the question of cost, he would assume that in each of these 8,000 cases £50 would be spent—not a very extravagant sum. If these 8,000 claims were investigated it would cost £400,000. The Government could not, therefore, accept the Amendment, and he did not think that any reasonable Member of the House could expect them to do so.

Mr. MEYSEY-THOMPSON said that if there were any bogus claims surely they ought to have an inquiry by a body other than the Estates Commissioners, who were already over-worked; and if they were to have an increased number of claims coming forward from America and elsewhere that was a reason for having an additional body to deal with these claims. If, however, the duty was thrown upon the Estates Commissioners why should they not hold a public inquiry? That body was appointed for one purpose, and the Government were going to ask them to do what they were not appointed to do. There was every ground for a public inquiry.

Mr. CLANCY said the Attorney-General for Ireland, it seemed to him, had under-estimated the length and cost of these investigations. He had not taken into account the length and power of speech of the right hon. Gentleman in whose name this Amendment stood. Let them imagine the right hon. Gentleman appearing before the Commissioners. He would begin with an indictment of the Commissioners. He had made a calculation as to the length of the right hon. Gentleman's observations before the Land Commissioners, and if made at equal length before this proposed tribunal this investigation would last for forty years. All the parties would be dead before the controversy came to an end; the lawyers would be dead, and the British taxpayers would be dead. His hon. and learned friend the Member for North Armagh or his descendants would have spent the fortune he got out of his estate long before the cases were decided. It was difficult to imagine what would happen. They might have Home Rule, or the Empire might have broken up before then. It really was a pity, though, that the Amendment could not be carried out, because it would benefit lawyers to such a large extent. But he could not dare to look forward to such a state of things; if he could entertain such an idea it would certainly be pleasurable. He could not understand, however, why, after all, the Amendment could be considered necessary, because if anyone examined Clause 2 he would find the most elaborate precautions taken that these claims should be investigated one way or another. He really did not know, having regard to the prospect held out, how he should vote on the Amendment.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG said he did not take quite such a gloomy view as the hon. Member and others of the result of the Amendment. The Estates Commissioners had by a process of weeding-out, been enabled to reduce the number of those claiming to be evicted tenants from 8,000 to 2,000, and it must be clear to the Attorney-General for Ireland and others that if the tests were applied which were set out in the Report there should be no difficulty in having an inquiry into the cases of all these tenants. The Estates Commissioners would have no difficulty in stating from their records that an applicant had voluntarily surrendered his holding or that he or his predecessors had been evicted more than twenty-five, and perhaps forty years ago, or that their eviction was due to the action of creditors or in consequence of family disputes, and so on through the other grounds on which the Commissioners made a distinction. So that instead of having a large number of cases to investigate, which were computed to last from thirteen to forty years, he thought the whole business could be done in a year. The tribunal would have a certain number of reports before them, and they would be able to dispose of the cases in the same way as those of fair rent claimants were disposed of, at the rate of thirty or forty a day. That being so, as the landlords were to be compulsorily dispossessed and the taxpayer was to pay for all these operations, the greatest care should be taken in choosing those people whose claims were *bona-fide*. Although the Chief Secretary said that everybody had confidence in the Estates Commissioners, and that they were just as well able to carry out these inquiries as anyone else, they had already told the right hon. Gentleman that a certain number of Members on those benches did not share his confidence. He thought it was desirable that they should have some further light as to how these tenants had been chosen, because it seemed that the Report of the Commissioners had been a perfunctory one. They did not see the tenants, but only had the report of their inspectors, on which they acted. He thought that was a very unsatisfactory way.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH said that in view of the compliment which had been paid to them on that side of the House, he hoped his remarks would not be taken as imputing any underhand or corrupt motives to the Attorney-General for Ireland and his colleagues. It could not be denied, however, that there was a certain amount of secrecy in regard to the Bill, and it would be for the advantage of the Committee if the Chief Secretary could elucidate the matter further. He would ask of what advantage had been this secrecy in the 2,000 cases. It was thrown in their teeth that these Commissioners had been appointed by the Party to which he belonged, but they were appointed for different duties. For these reasons he hoped the Chief Secretary would see his way to give that publicity which would be in the interest of the evicted tenant and of the public.

MR. MOORE said he knew that it was a high and solemn misdemeanour to suggest that there was anything approaching secrecy in regard to the Bill, but he would take the consequences. Powers were given to take £15,000 or £20,000 worth of land, but the owners of the property did not know for what reason it was taken. The evicted tenants were selected without public inquiry, and in regard to the taking of land no appeal was given. He was surprised to hear the Attorney-General for Ireland compiling an amusing calculation, working out that it would take thirteen or fourteen years to dispose of the question if there was an inquiry. He hardly thought he treated the House seriously, because the right hon. Gentleman knew perfectly well that the Land Commission Court had heard fair rent appeals for years and had disposed of forty or fifty cases a day. The process was that the rents on one estate were all taken together. The landlord was represented by a firm of solicitors in regard to the whole number of cases, and the applicants, thirty or forty perhaps in number, were also represented by the same firm of solicitors. That Court could on an average certainly deal with thirty cases a day, and he could not understand why it should be assumed that in this instance each case would take half a day to decide. It was a ridiculous compilation to say that thirteen years would be required for the work. As they had no guarantee that it would be dealt with at a later stage of the Bill, or in the course of the discussion on the measure, he was obliged at the present juncture to vote for the provision embodied in the Amendment that there should be a public inquiry, which he took to be a public inquiry dealing with the whole matter. Although he hardly dared say so, because if he did he would be taunted by the Chief Secretary with harbouring unworthy motives, he wished to express the opinion that an inquiry was a proper course at every stage where property was passing and where there had been in the past an undue amount of secrecy, especially in a case where the result of the proceedings would be that tenants were to receive forty acres of land apiece and £300 to stock it.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) desired to say one word in favour of public inquiry. During the whole of these debates he had been impressed by the indisposition of the Government to give information for which Members of the Opposition had again and again asked.

The English taxpayers were interested in this matter, and they who were called upon to pay were entitled to know what were the conditions under which the money was to be spent. There should be public inquiry stage by stage and step by step. Concealment or anything which tended to throw a veil over the proceedings would be at once mischievous in itself and have the necessary result of creating suspicion, doubt, and uncertainty, while operating prejudicially against the successful working of the Act. He was not quite sure whether the desire for concealment was not one of the many dangers which were threatening them. He had ventured on one or two occasions in the course of the session to warn the House or the Committee against these pending dangers. One of the dangers was the increasing indisposition to make facts public. In concealment was danger; in publicity, safety. He was very glad that his hon. friend had made this proposal, and he should have very much pleasure in voting for it.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) said he greatly regretted that hon. Gentlemen above the gangway had not proposed that there should be public inquiry into land purchase under the Act of 1903. It had been said that the hon. Member for North Armagh had sold his land at extravagant prices; he was quite sure that was not accurate; but if hon. Gentlemen had recommended the right hon. Member for Dover to put in his Bill a provision for that public inquiry which they were now advocating, in respect of the £100,000,000 and £12,000,000 bonus which had been given to the Irish landlords, he could quite conceive that the most salutary consequences would have resulted. They had been told that the Duke of Leinster got £1,000,000 in precedence of everybody else, and if there had been a public inquiry before he got that immense sum he could quite understand that the public would have come in to listen why he should be given priority. The Duke of Abercorn had got an enormous sum of public money in connection with the various Land Purchase Acts. He believed that Lord Londonderry had sold a considerable portion of his estates in the North of Ireland, but he had never heard the noble Lord the Member for Maidstone suggest that there should be an inquiry into the conditions under which Lord Londonderry sold his estates. What was sauce for the goose was sauce for the gander. Why should they have left £112,000,000 to be dealt with without inquiry by the Commissioners in whom they now proclaimed that nobody had the slightest confidence and now demand public inquiry when it was a question of £2,000,000 to reinstate these poor evicted tenants? It seemed to him that hon. Gentlemen above the gangway were making themselves companions with strange bed-follows. They would come into office again, and they would hear of these things. *Hansard* would be searched in the future; they would read of these adjurations about the corruptness of these Commissioners, and would ask themselves why these men could have been satisfied to ladle out public money without anything in the nature of a public inquiry when it was the case of the landlords and insist on public inquiry when it was the case of the tenants. He would suggest to hon. Members above the gangway that they were taking a dangerous line, not only upon this question, but upon many others, as they would find a little later. The denunciations of principles which they were making to-day when the Liberals were in office would come home to roost very often when they themselves were back in power.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) said he did not think his hon. friends need be disturbed by the prophecies of the hon. and learned Gentleman, nor in the least alarmed about inquiry into certain land purchase. Lord Londonderry, in fact, sold his land long before the Act of 1903.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Was there a public inquiry?

MR. WALTER LONG said that in regard to the Duke of Abercorn and the other landlords no priority was given to them other than what was due to the time at which they made the applications. The hon. and learned Gentleman knew perfectly well that the whole of the transactions under the Act of 1903 were on the voluntary principle; and he also knew perfectly well that there was the greatest possible difference between transactions of a voluntary character and those which were compulsory. Where county councils and other public authorities were authorised to take land compulsorily a public inquiry was held at which the authority had to justify the taking of the land. He was inclined to agree with his hon. friend the Member for North Armagh that this stage was the wrong one for inquiry. He was not aware that there had been any allegation made on those benches against the Commissioners of the kind suggested by the hon. and learned Member. It was inevitable that there should be statements made about those gentlemen, because owing to the duties they had to perform they were occasionally forced into an attitude which led to their expressing opinions on what the Government policy ought to be. It was not the duty of permanent officials to deal with questions of policy; that was a matter for Ministers of the Crown; but the position of the Commissioners was so peculiar that from time to time they had been called upon, because of the peculiarities and difficulties of the land question, to make suggestions and criticisms of which he had always regretted the necessity, but in regard to which no one would suggest *mala fides* on the part of the Estates Commissioners. What they said was that, at some stage, not, he thought, the preliminary stage, but after all preliminary inquiries had been made, and when the number of tenants had dwindled down to the ultimate selection at which these gentlemen had arrived, and when the land was to be compulsorily acquired, there should be some procedure of a public character, so that the facts might be known to all concerned, and especially to those whose land was to be taken. Surely, it was not an unreasonable demand, where everyone was concerned in the successful working of the Act, that there should be some farther declaration of the reasons which had governed the Estates Commissioners in the discharge of their duties, other than those which were available now. In the interests of the Commissioners themselves he thought it was highly desirable that there should be public information available for all. The Commissioners would receive criticism enough, however successful they might be in the discharge of this most difficult task, but the criticism would not be so bitter if there was a publication of the reasons upon which they based their action. He thought it was possible for the Government to devise some method by which the public could be put in possession of the facts of the various cases, and it would be in the interests of all concerned, and, not least, of the Commissioners themselves, that such a method should be devised. It would only be carrying out what the Government had repeatedly said was their object and intention.

MR. BIRRELL said the Commissioners had two duties to discharge. First, they had to ascertain the class of persons to be benefited by the Bill, and they had to ascertain the Christian names, surnames, and addresses of those whom it was proposed to restore to the land. The other duty they had to discharge was of a wholly different character, and related to the machinery they had to employ for the purpose of getting the land, namely, whether the land was to be acquired voluntarily by agreement or compulsorily. That would be dealt with when they came to consider Clause 2, and there would be full opportunity for discussing that clause. With regard to the simple ascertainment of the individual, he confessed he could not for the life of him understand—probably it arose from ignorance of Irish life and politics—why there was this passionate desire on the part of gentlemen opposite to be supplied with the names of the evicted tenants, whose cases would be investigated by the Estates Commissioners, to see whether they were suitable persons to be supplied with land. He did not know why they wanted the names before the time came to restore those tenants. He quite understood that the landlords wished to know somehow or other who were the persons that were to become purchasers of their land; that was a very natural desire. But at the present moment what object would be gained; what good would be done? Supposing he was able now to read out the names of the 2,000 persons, did they want those names to be handed about and made the subject matter of Questions and Answers in that House? All he could say was that the restoration of this limited number of evicted tenants would be impossible unless the House recognised that it was a bit of business which had got to be done as quickly as it could be done by the tribunal who were to deal with it, he would not say in a rough and ready fashion, but as summarily and as speedily as possible. By passing this Bill the House took upon itself the obligation of providing some machinery whereby as speedily as possible these 2,000 people should be provided with land. They had given that power to the Estates Commissioners. He had been obliged to find some tribunal and the men he had chosen were the nominees of right hon. Gentlemen opposite. Those men had been engaged in this kind of work for a great number of years, and no Motion had ever been made to remove them. He thought they knew more about the value of land in all the counties of Ireland than anyone else. If they referred it to a Roscommon jury to fix the value of grass land in Roscommon that might be in accordance with the eternal principle of justice, but they were debarred from adopting that plan by the conditions existing in Ireland, and that would not be considered fair treatment. Consequently they selected the men who were already discharging these duties. They did not all look at these things from the same point of view, but to say that they were unfit to fix the value of land in a matter of this sort and provide 2,000 tenants with small holdings without having a public inquiry was absurd.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we ought to keep to the point raised in the Amendment.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.) said he agreed with the hon. Baronet the Member for Wigan that the English taxpayer had a financial as well as a moral interest in this matter. Many of the tenants had been upon their farms for twenty-four years.

The CHAIRMAN: I must remind the hon. Member that this is a question of whether the Commissioners are to inquire into the fitness of the applicants by a public inquiry.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT said his point was the great need for a public inquiry, which was doubly important after what had been said about the men who were coming home from New Zealand and America to make all kinds of vague claims for these farms.

The CHAIRMAN: That is a point which does not arise. The question is whether they are fit and proper persons to become purchasers under the Act.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG said the Chief Secretary appeared to be at a loss to understand why the Opposition were so anxious to have a public inquiry, and why they proposed to press the Amendment to a division. The answer was simple. The chief reason was that when the Act of 1903 was being discussed they were led to understand by the best expert Ireland could produce, the Leader of the Irish Party, that there were about 400 or 600 evicted tenants. Now they were told that there were 3,000, 1,000 who had been reinstated and 2,000 waiting to be reinstated. Surely those remarkable figures were sufficient justification for the claim for some sort of an open court in which the applications of these 2,000 persons could be made public. The Chief Secretary had constantly referred to the impartiality of the Estates Commissioners. He had never charged the Commissioners with corruption; but he went the length of saying that they were prejudiced in favour of the evicted tenants, and they had not the confidence of the parties whose land was going to be taken. He had made that statement before, and it had never been contradicted. If it were true the very least the promoters of the Bill could do was to let every step taken under it be as public as possible. It was not a small matter. A transaction by which such a large amount of land as 80,000 acres was to be taken compulsorily at a cost of about £2,000,000 could not be called a small matter. At the origin of this transaction it was understood that it should be carried through on voluntary lines. That understanding had now been wrongly departed from, and, therefore, in order to mitigate the severity with which it would fall upon the owners of land the least the Government could do was to give the greatest publicity to the steps taken under the Bill.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 88; Noes, 321. (Division List No. 300.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt.Hn.SirAlexF
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey,-Fletcher Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, RtHn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt.HnG(Winchester)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N
Beach, Hn.MichaelHughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt.HonVictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R.(Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J (Birming'm
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, CharlesCurtis(Antrim, S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan, Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gretton, John
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hervey, F.W.F(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt.Hn. Col. W.
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long, Col.CharlesW(Evesham
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Roberts, S.(Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, F.E.(Liverpool, Walton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A.Stanley(York, E.R.
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Viscount Valentia and Lord Balcarres.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey(Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, SirJ.H(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, RtHnRichard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J.(Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Daves, Ellis William (Eifion)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, SirJ.A.(Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras, N.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col.Alan (Hereford, S
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.

Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gurdon, Rt. Hn. Sir W Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T. F (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-und.-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)

Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh., N.)
Wilson, P.W. (St. Pancras, S.
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL moved an Amendment for the purpose of limiting the persons in whose favour the measure was to be administered to those whom the Estates Commissioners "have prior to the date of the passing of this Act, determined to be" fit and proper persons to become purchasers under the Land Purchase Acts. He said that as the clause stood at present the primary determination by the Estates Commissioners as to who should be re-instated was postponed until after the Act passed. In other words it would enable the Estates Commissioners after the Bill became law to settle afresh what they had already investigated. He did not suggest that that was an enterprise upon which they would willingly embark. He wanted it to be put out of the power of anybody to put pressure, direct or indirect, upon the Commissioners to induce them to alter that list they had already arrived at, and which, as the Chief Secretary had said, was by this time practically complete. He could not see why there should be any opposition or objection to the Amendment. All he proposed to do was to confine the persons to be re-instated to persons who at the time of the passing of the Act were on the list made by the Estates Commissioners. He wished to secure that there should be finality about the matter, although he was willing to postpone that finality until the Bill became an Act. That was a reasonable suggestion. The Chief Secretary had said that he could not understand why there was no confidence expressed in the Estates Commissioners by Unionists. The hon. and learned Member for North Louth had suggested that there had been charges of corruption brought against the Estates Commissioners. Unionists had never made any suggestion of that kind. He declared, however, that the majority of the Estates Commissioners had not the confidence of the persons whose property would be affected by the Bill. He was not concerned as to whether that was due to the Estates Commissioners or to the unreasonable suspicion of the landowners. It was not the first time when the property of a particular class was being taken that Parliament had been asked not to hand over the administration of the duties connected with the taking of that property to a class of officials who had not the confidence of the persons whose property was going to be attacked. When the great Land Act of 1881 was passed, hon. Gentlemen below the gangway imputed corruption to the county court judges, and Mr. Gladstone yielded to their request and set up a new tribunal of sub-commissioners for fixing fair rents under that Act. Surely in the present case the only people whose property and interests were concerned were a particular class; it was not unreasonable, therefore, that landowners should ask that the administration of the Act should not be handed over to a body in which they had, for good or bad reasons, no confidence whatever, and that there should be some period fixed for determining the evicted tenants to be in reinstated, especially as the Committee had been assured by the Chief Secretary that the investigation was practically at an end. He asked that after the passing of the Act there should be no alteration of the list, but that the list which was then in the hands of the Commissioners should be taken to be final for the purposes of the Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 20, to leave out the words 'consider,' and insert the words 'have, prior to the date of the passing of this Act, determined.'"—(*Mr. James Campbell.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'consider' stand part of the clause."

MR. BIRRELL said the Amendment was one for which a great deal might be said; but the question was one of such a minute character that it really could not be worth consideration. He still pleaded that in the interests of the solution of a difficult question there might be some latitude allowed. As a matter of fact, he had very little doubt that by the end of August or very early in September the Commissioners would have completed their work to their own satisfaction. In one sense they had completed it now, and he did not think that probably there would be much injustice done if the Amendment were inserted, and if their labours were absolutely closed on the passing of the Act, probably next Monday. On the other hand, he was assured that there were a few cases upon which they contemplated they might wish to have some time. They might be cases which would have the effect of reducing the number to be restored, or they might be cases in which they had to inquire as to the capacity and character of the tenant to be restored. The question, therefore, was one of the minutest possible character, just as it was in the case of those who had not come over from America and New Zealand, and he dared say that, if the Amendment were accepted, it would only finally close the door on some half-dozen whose claims had not yet been decided. He did not, however, see why it should be closed upon them. They were told that the Amendment was moved in the interests of the Commissioners, and to save them from the overwhelming pressure of all the people they had rejected, who would claim to have their claims reconsidered. Those people, however, would not get that reconsideration, even if they made the demand. It was simply and solely in the interests of doing justice in delicate matters of administration that he found himself unable to agree with the Amendment, although he quite recognised that, even if it were accepted, it would do harm in no more than a limited number of cases. Those cases, however, might come within the purview of the Bill, and he did not propose to agree to fixing a hard and fast time whereby those who were entitled to receive consideration would be ruled out of court for all time.

MR. MOORE said he supported the Amendment because he understood that what the right hon. and learned Member for Dublin University was striving for was that there should be some definite period for dealing with evicted tenants, so that there might be finality in the matter. It was in the interests of the evicted tenants themselves, and in the interests of others concerned, that the number of claimants should be crystallised as from a given date. The Chief Secretary had admitted that the Amendment was a reasonable one, but had refused to accept it because it was too small. If the right hon. Gentleman did accept it, he would probably gain the time which would be occupied in its discussion, and he might also gain a reputation for being reasonable. He should not be so stiff as to refuse to accept an Amendment against which he could say nothing. If Unionist Members were not to be allowed to see the list of evicted tenants which had been given to Nationalist Members, at least the names should be put on record so that they could not be afterwards expanded in number.

MR. MEYSEY-THOMPSON said the hon. and learned Member for Waterford the other day accused him of want of trust in the Estates Commissioners, and he wanted to say that he had no intention whatever of expressing the slightest want of confidence in those gentlemen in so far as they did their work. All he said or intended to say was that he thought an *ad hoc* body should be created to deal with the cases of the evicted tenants.

*MR. ASHLEY said there were two points to be considered. One was the possibility of doing injustice to some half-dozen tenants, and the other was the probability of an agitation being started in Ireland to have put back on the list the whole 5,400 applicants who had been rejected. That was what the case came to. He would be very sorry to see injustice done to anybody, but he thought the danger of an agitation springing up should outweigh the consideration of that possibility.

SIR F. BANBURY was sorry the right hon. Gentleman could not accept the Amendment. The Attorney-General had refused the last Amendment on the ground that it was such a large Amendment and would take up thirteen years. This, however, was an extremely simple Amendment, and would not take up any time at all. The Attorney-General's argument therefore did not apply. The Chief Secretary had said that five or six cases of injustice might occur if the proposed limitation was put in, but wherever there was a limitation cases of injustice must arise. It was beyond the wit of man to devise a limitation which would not press severely upon a certain number of people. The right hon. Gentleman had already put in one limitation, because applications had to be made before May, 1907. There might be some few cases of injustice under that limitation. Why, therefore, should not a further limitation, which according to the right hon. Gentleman's own showing would only result in injustice to some six or seven people, be inserted? The right hon. Gentleman admitted that the Amendment was reasonable. His real reason for refusing to accept it was not because it would result in injustice to a few people, but because it would offend hon. Members below the gangway.

MR. WALTER LONG said he would like to make a suggestion before they went to a division. The right hon. Gentleman had said that he had no objection to the merits of the Amendment, and that he only objected to it because it might possibly exclude some half-dozen cases, which cases he believed would be cleared up early in September. He had laughed at the suggestion that unless they did put some limit in the Bill in all probability a very large number of extra cases would be pressed upon the Commissioners. He (Mr. Long) did not think anybody who had had any practical experience of the question would share the right hon. Gentleman's views as to the prospects before the Bill. Everybody knew that when it had passed if no limit were imposed there would be pressed on the Estates Commissioners a very great number of cases, and not the half-dozen of which the right hon. Gentleman had spoken, which ought not to be included. If therefore the right hon. Gentleman did not accept this Amendment he might perhaps put in some date, the 1st of September or 1st of October, so that there might be some date before which these half-dozen cases might be adjudicated upon or revised, but which would impose a limit beyond which no further cases could be considered by the Estates Commissioners.

MR. BIRRELL said he could assure the right hon. Member that the Estates Commissioners were fully alive to this matter, and it was their fixed intention as speedily as possible to complete the list and exercise their minds in adjudicating these claims. Once having satisfied their consciences in the matter, and settled the matter, they would not re-open any case in any shape or way. Although it might seem reasonable to fix such a limit as was suggested, he thought the Committee should be satisfied with the assurance he had given. The Estates Commissioners had almost completed their labours, but there were still certain cases in which they might have included persons who, on further information, might be found to be improper persons, and in which they had excluded persons who might be found to be proper persons for reinstatement. This was as he had said a somewhat rough-and-ready way of finding out who these people were, and to impose this limit might impose some hardship. The method had, however, to be adopted, otherwise the work would have been interminable. He could not accept the Amendment, which would impose a limitation which he did not think was necessary.

*MR. BUTCHER (Cambridge University) said it was quite true that the friends of this Bill, at present, seemed to acquiesce in the restricted figure of 2,000 which the Estates Commissioners had arrived at. The Committee had heard but little, though they had heard something of the enlargement of that number. But at present the list of selected applicants remained private. Every one who had applied hoped and believed he was a successful applicant, but the moment the list became public there would be a rush of applicants, and every sort of political and other pressure would be brought to bear to enforce the claim of those persons who had applied and been refused. Everybody knew the rapidity with which these things grew; the 800 had increased to 8,000 in an incredibly short space of time. America, England, Scotland, all had provided their quota.

And who could doubt that when once a Department of State was set on foot for the restoration of evicted tenants and Commissioners were invested with compulsory powers, all evicted tenants who were on the original list would again put their demands with increasing insistence? The Estates Commissioners were a semi-judicial body whom it was right to protect against undue political pressure and influence in the exercise of very difficult duties. He should vote in favour of the Amendment.

MR. ASHLEY asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would not, as he had admitted that these persons were likely to be hardly hit if this Amendment was not carried, accept the suggestion of the right hon. Member for South Dublin, and reinstate these men under Section 2 of the Act of 1903.

MR. MOORE said he regarded this Amendment as one of the first importance. The Committee had been told that the evicted tenants numbered 2,000, and the Chief Secretary had told them that all outside that figure could be settled on the land by voluntary purchase. Those he concluded would include the 4,000 whom the Estates Commissioners decided did not, and were not fit to, come in under this Bill.

THE CHAIRMAN said he did not think the matter arose on this Amendment.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 314; Noes, 92. (Division List No. 301.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith, Rt. Hon Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr- omm, H. W.
Caus on, Rt. Hn Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Elibank, Master of
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N)
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)

Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mptn
Richardson, A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberston, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, William
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex. F
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.

Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Cochrane Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan, Robt. (Lanark, Govan
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gretton, John
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds)
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

MR. MOORE moved to insert, at the end of the clause, the words, "Provided that such persons have been evicted for non-payment of rent or under judgment or decree for rent." His object, he said, was to exclude from the definition of evicted tenant, and, therefore, from the benefits of this Bill, those persons who had been evicted from their farms in consequence of decrees obtained by ordinary creditors or of ejectments in title. Hon. Members were aware that evictions in Ireland took place from different causes and for different reasons. It had always been understood that the evicted tenant problem with which the House had attempted to deal was that of restoring to their holdings those tenants who had been evicted for non-payment of rent and for that cause alone. In Ireland if a man was indebted to his butcher or his baker the latter could get judgment against the debtor, and, if he had a farm could, if it was not subject to a mortgage, proceed to sell him up. If there was a mortgage he could have his judgment registered as a mortgage and still sell him up and evict him. Another case which hon. Members had not considered was that of a man who did not come within the Act of 1881, who had a long lease the term of which had expired and he was evicted because the landlord wanted to resume possession. That was called an ejectment on title. There were also other classes of eviction. Therefore he thought it was only right to amend this clause so as to ensure that the only evicted tenants who derived advantage from the Bill should be those who were evicted for the non-payment of rent. It was never intended that evicted tenants of any other kind should come under it.

Amendment proposed—

"At the end of the clause to add the words 'Provided that such persons have been evicted for non-payment of rent or under judgment or decree for rent.'"—(*Mr. Moore.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. CHERRY thought there was some weight in the argument that these men would be technically and literally in the position of being evicted tenants and would be within the words of Clause 2 of the Act of 1903. He did not think they should be included, and the Government had no desire to extend that clause. Landlords, however, frequently took advantage of their position to proceed against tenants as ordinary creditors, and recovering the rent as an ordinary debt, seized the holding. When landlords took those steps there was nothing to distinguish them from the ordinary creditor who had taken similar steps to recover a debt. The hon. and learned Member suggested that all these cases should be excluded, because he would confine the

Bill to persons evicted for non-payment of rent.

MR. MOORE said the words of the Amendment were, "Who have been evicted for non-payment of rent or under judgment or decree for rent."

MR. CHERRY thought those words would exclude the cases to which he had referred, but the Government would not like to accept the Amendment in the form in which it had been moved, and what they proposed to do was to substitute a form of words on Report.

MR. CLANCY suggested that the right hon. Gentleman ought to hear arguments against this and similar Amendments before he offered to make any concession.

MR. CHERRY said he was ready to hear any arguments that might be used, but his feeling was, that this was a Bill for tenants who had been evicted from their holdings by their landlords, and not by their butchers or bakers or others. That was all they proposed to do. The hon. Member should have let him finish his remarks. He seemed to be afraid of his conceding too much.

MR. CLANCY thought the tendency of the Government was to give way on everything that was proposed.

MR. CHERRY said the Government tried to do what was just and right in the case. They had not accepted many Amendments proposed by the Opposition. They proposed to bring up on Report a form of words which would confine the Bill to evicted tenants who had been evicted by their landlords, or at the suit of their landlords, where they had been turned out of possession. It would exclude cases where family disputes had led to evictions, and also where the proceedings of ordinary creditors had led to evictions. It was fair and reasonable that that should be inserted.

MR. MOORE: Am I to understand that the Amendment the right hon. Gentleman proposes is to be restricted to evictions for non-payment of rent? If the landlord ejects the tenant on title the tenant must come in.

MR. CHERRY: The hon. Gentleman must wait until the Amendment is put down. Our object is to exclude the cases mentioned of evictions by butchers and bakers and younger brothers.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) said that of all harsh cases connected with eviction ejectment on title was the worst. Mr. Gladstone had refused to include leaseholders in the Act of 1881, and for six years the leaseholders of Ireland in many cases paid rents after their leases had expired. In many cases the enlargement of the Act which came later on never affected them, and it was not till 1896 that a whole shoal of exclusions disappeared, while in the meantime the landlord availed himself of every little flaw in the title to eject these unfortunate men. Mr. Gladstone, in whose character extraordinary Conservatism was sometimes shown, would not even enable a present tenant to be artificially created. The Tory Government, however, accepted an Amendment as a matter of course, and a present tenant could now be created artificially. He instanced the case of joint tenants and tenants in common. They had put an Amendment in the Act of 1896, and immediately the Court of Appeal ran a spear through it. In 1903, again, the Conservative Party amended the law, and these men were now entitled to a fair rent, though in the meantime numbers of them had been ejected. The Front Opposition Bench had a clean record on this business, because nearly every one of the valuable Amendments of the Act of 1881 had been made owing to the clear-sightedness of the Conservative Party. Were they now to turn round and, before their Amendments of the law had had time to take effect, say that the men who had been unjustly evicted were not to get the benefit of the amended law? He really could not fathom the spirit of Gentlemen above the gangway, haggling and niggling in order to exclude one or two unfortunate men. It was not common justice. They were against the campaigners, the "immoral" men who would not pay their rent; but the men they now sought to exclude were men who were sound rent-payers, but who had some flaw in their title which Parliament had subsequently remedied. He advised Members above the gangway to let the House of Lords shape their Amendments for them. Was not every landlord in Ireland a Member of the House of Lords? The promoters of this Amendment were not landlords; they were only lawyers, and they had not even got the landlords as their clients. The great advantage of the House of Lords was that they had a packed jury of landlords, making Amendments to suit themselves—the real Simon Pures who considered their own cases and their own estates. The evicting landlords would all be there. When he saw an Amendment with Lord Clanricarde's name attached to it he knew that it was an authoritative Amendment moved by the landlord Party. Members in the Lower House were mere journeymen who knew nothing of the intricacies of the Irish case, and made mighty poor grand inquisitors. He urged the Government to be chary as to the Amendments they promised. If the rent was not paid, the landlord would evict. If it was paid, perhaps the mealman would go unpaid, and he would come forward and get judgment, and the tenant would be turned out because he had paid the landlord the money he ought to have paid the mealman. It was not so simple a matter as hon. Members considered it to be. The Government had appointed a tribunal which nobody supposed was going to be unfair to the landlords, and this was a matter which might safely be left to its discretion. He thought they would be making a great mistake if they did not at least wait and see what the House of Lords proposed to do.

MR. WALTER LONG said the Government would not, he thought, be shaken in their determination by the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman, who had omitted any reference to the Report of the Commissioners on which this Bill was very largely founded. Clause 20, Subsection 4, dealt with creditors other than landlords, and they had, therefore, actually the avowed intention of the Commissioners, on which they had already acted. All the Government had done was to give effect to what the Attorney-General said had been their object and intention, namely, to make the Bill applicable to a particular class of cases; and he thought they were indebted to the Government for having accepted the Amendment of his hon. friend in the spirit, as he understood that the Attorney-General had undertaken to bring up on the Report stage an Amendment to carry out the views, speaking generally, which his hon. friend had just now expressed. He hoped they would not be prevented from carrying out that object by any jocular observations from below the gangway.

MR. BIRRELL said the Commissioners assured him that not a single person that had been placed upon the list of cases had been evicted for anything but the non-payment of rent, and the substance of the case was very fairly met by the Amendment as altered by the Attorney-General. In regard to what had been said about another place, a Minister was under an obligation to do his duty by the House of which he happened to be a Member. and could not consent to insert in a Bill what he might think to be incorrect because there was another tribunal animated by a strong bias the other way, and that anything that could be urged in favour of those affected would be given effect to by them. There was not in this matter any real disagreement between the Government and Members below the gangway. It was agreed that at all times what was contemplated was the reinstatement of those who, for political reasons, took part in a war which had remarkable legislative results and who for that reason were turned out of their holdings. Those were the only people who could claim to be reinstated and they were the only class who would be found in the list.

*MR. HERBERT (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe) said it struck him that unless great care was taken in drafting the Amendment cases which were really evictions for non-payment of rent might appear to be evictions at the suit of ordinary judgment creditors; for example, a landlord might have assigned his rent to his butcher or tailor who might have obtained judgment and evicted the tenant on the judgment, so that he would appear to have been evicted by his tradesman for non-payment of a debt and not for non-payment of rent. So again a judgment creditor of the landlord might obtain a garnishee Order and again appear as an ordinary execution creditor of the tenant when in fact the eviction took place for non-payment of rent. Although no doubt the principle laid down might be a perfectly right one he hoped care would be taken in drafting to see that cases would not be included which were not intended to be included.

MR. MOORE asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Leave being refused, the Amendment was negatived.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH moved the omission of Subsection (*b*), which includes among those for whom land is to be compulsorily acquired "new tenants to whom this Act applies, that is to say, tenants and persons nominated by the Estates Commissioners as personal representatives of tenants of holdings formerly occupied by evicted tenants to whom this Act applies." He explained that the Amendment dealt with the so-called "planters." He objected to the manner in which the Bill proposed to deal with the tenants who for twenty-five years had been in possession of holdings from which tenants had formerly been evicted for non-payment of rent or other causes. Such tenants were entitled to their commiseration. He would like to place before the Committee some of the hardships which these new tenants had of necessity to undergo. They might have been cultivating their holding for twenty-five years and brought up a family upon it, and yet, under the Bill, they would be dispossessed, and an evicted tenant, who might not have worked his holding in the manner in which it should be worked, might be put in his place. That was an injustice of the highest order. In many cases those tenants had exhibited a courageous character, and had accepted tasks which in many cases involved danger to their lives. To dispossess them would be an act of injustice. The subsection would also place in the hands of the Estates Commissioners a discriminating power which it was never intended they should exercise, because they were originally appointed for a totally different purpose. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 22, to leave out Subsection (*b*)."—(*Viscount Castlereagh.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'new tenants' stand part of the clause."

MR. J. F. MASON (Windsor) thought the subsection both unjust and unnecessary. He could not see why two people should be disturbed for the sake of reinstating one. If either of the tenants—the new tenant or the evicted tenant—had a sentimental attachment to a particular holding it was more likely to be the man who had lived there during the last twenty-four years than the man who was evicted twenty-four years ago and since then had lived somewhere else. If a man had been cultivating his farm satisfactorily nothing could be gained by moving him to another farm. This double movement for the sake of reinstating one man would be tinged with a considerable amount of resentment and bad feeling, and the cost to the taxpayers would be very considerable. He supported the Amendment.

MR. BIRRELL said it was impossible for the Government to accept the Amendment, and he did not think the hon. Members who had spoken had fully apprehended its effect. It would not only prevent new tenants being required to give up their holding for another holding or for money compensation, but it would prevent part of the land being acquired for those new tenants who had voluntarily agreed to give up their present holdings. Many of the new tenants sat very lightly in their present holdings, and would very willingly go upon the terms of the Bill. They had not acquired the holdings naturally. They were somewhat artificially introduced to them. In many places they were regarded as only caretakers of the land—perpetual evidence of the strife the Government were seeking to put an end to. They would jump at the terms of the Bill, and would gladly either take land offered them elsewhere, or, if they were satisfied that agricultural pursuits did not suit them, take the monetary compensation provided under the Bill. Not only was it necessary that they should have the power to acquire parcels of land for actually reinstating the old tenants upon their former holdings and give the new tenants a holding elsewhere, but they required land for tenants who would not be turned out at all. He did not contemplate that there would be many cases in which there would be actual eviction of new tenants. If powers were taken to acquire land for the purpose of providing the new tenants with farms elsewhere he thought the difficulty of the case would be solved. Subsection (*b*) was of the very essence of the measure, and it was necessary that it should be allowed to remain in order that there should be power to obtain the land required for the carrying through of the purposes of the Bill.

Mr. WALTER LONG said he understood that it was impossible for the Government so agree to the elimination of the subsection, as its omission would strike at the very foundation of the Bill. He was glad the discussion had been raised, for there was no part of the Bill to which he objected more than that which proposed to get rid of the new tenants in order to make room for the evicted tenants. One wondered at the necessity for the Bill at all if these people were so anxious to go, provided there was power to give them the necessary compensation. If the right hon. Gentleman's information was accurate a great many of these people would not be seriously interfered with. He thought the right hon. Gentleman would find that there was a much larger number who did not answer the description he had given of the new tenants. A considerable number of these men had carried on their work under circumstances of great difficulty, and they were men for whom the Attorney-General had no sympathy at all. They had become unpopular for doing their duty, and as it was a great trouble to look after them the Attorney-General thought it was better to put in somebody else. Of course that was a very good reason for a Minister who wanted to lessen the difficulties of his situation, but he and his friends did not regard it as a good reason at all for using public money to dispossess men who in many cases had stood up against long odds in doing their best to cultivate their holdings satisfactorily. He agreed with the Chief Secretary that the subsection was necessary, and he was inclined to advise his noble friend not to press the Amendment to a division. It would prevent provision being made in the shape of fresh holdings for any of the new tenants whose removal might be voluntarily arranged. That would be, of course, to do them a considerable injustice. Surely arrangements might be made for dealing with these cases without the excessive powers proposed to be taken.

Mr. MOORE said he wished to make a suggestion with reference to the drafting of the clause. Instead of "tenants of holdings" he suggested that the words "occupiers of land" should be substituted. He understood that on the Clanricarde estate ninety holdings had become forty-five through some holdings being amalgamated. If the clause limited the application of the Bill to holdings which were formerly occupied by evicted tenants, there might be considerable trouble, in view of decisions under the Land Acts, in regard to holdings which had ceased to exist.

Mr. CHERRY said he was much obliged for the suggestion, which would improve the language of the clause. The right hon. Member for South Dublin had seemed to think that he was animated by some bitter animosity towards the new tenants. He had no animosity towards them at all. On the contrary, he had a good deal of sympathy with them. The Government had done everything they possibly could in the Bill to see that these tenants should get perfectly fair play and everything for their advantage. They were mainly men who had been brought from a different part of Ireland; for instance, Ulster men had been brought down to occupy evicted farms in the South of Ireland. They had not been very happy there. He did not say what the cause of it was, but the Government wished to put an end to it. They thought that these men would be more prosperous and happy if they were brought back and placed where they could carry out their work where the country was quieter. They believed that the majority of these men would agree at once to the removal, but there were some men who would not even in their own interest give up the holdings they occupied. It was a common thing for people when they lost their tempers to do things which were bad for themselves. These men had been badly treated and they had lost their tempers, and some of them said, "We will stick here because we are determined to fight to the bitter end." The Government therefore took power in the Bill to remove these men for their own interest against their own will. It was to meet such cases alone that they thought that the compulsory clause should be put in. He had no hostile feeling towards these men. He wanted to see them treated fairly, but be wanted to see peace in the country. He did not want the necessity to continue of having an army of police to surround particular holdings. The Government thought their proposals would be fair to all parties concerned.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH said he was glad of the assurance that the new tenants were to be fairly and reasonably treated, but he felt apprehensive that there would be a certain amount of injustice as regarded the apportionment of tenancies. He was aware that there had been a good deal of amicable settlement and he trusted there would be more in future. He begged leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. O'SHEE moved to include within the scope of the section "new tenant purchasers" as well as "new tenants." He said that the effect of the Bill would be largely nugatory unless this Amendment were adopted. There was no real distinction between the new tenant and the new tenant purchaser. He could illustrate this by stating the circumstances of a case in his own constituency. An estate there was owned by Mrs. Williams, who lived in England. There were in 1890 three tenants on the estate, and in that year two of them were evicted. Mr. Purcell, the agent of the estate, who lived about thirty or forty miles from the place, got possession of the two evicted farms, but his position was that of a mere planter. Under the Act of 1903, Mrs. Williams lodged an application for the sale of her estate, and Mr. Purcell had already been negotiating with the Estates Commissioners as to the price to be paid to him for giving up the two holdings so as to enable the Estates Commissioners to reinstate the evicted tenants. He was informed also that Mr. Purcell had signed an agreement to purchase the two evicted holdings, and, therefore, his vesting order might be made before this Bill came into operation. There had been a difference of opinion between Mr. Purcell, who wanted to get compensation, and the Estates Commissioners, who were anxious not to give him more than his just due. Mr. Purcell had never made any improvements since 1890; he had never lived on his land since that date; and, although his holding had deteriorated, the Estates Commissioners were willing to give him some £200 if he would give up his goodwill. Mr. Purcell wanted more. Notwithstanding this, a vesting order might be made any day. In such a case it would be contrary to all common-sense and to the intentions of the Government that Mr. Purcell should be in a position by reason of his vesting order being made to say to the Estates Commissioners that they would not give him what he wanted, that he thought he ought to have £1,000, and that, although he had never done anything to improve the land, they could not restore the evicted tenants because he was the holder of the land and would not give it up unless they gave him £1,000. What would the Estates Commissioners do? He challenged them to find in the whole county of Waterford 100 acres of untenanted land. There were in that county, according to the Report of the Estates Commissioners, 120 cases suitable for restoration, and there were thirty-eight more cases to be dealt with. There would, therefore, probably be a total of 150 persons for whom holdings would have to be provided either by purchasing the interests of the planters or grabbers who had gone into possession or by obtaining untenanted land. They had only provided for twenty-four tenants up to the present, and there was no more untenanted land to be had. The proportion of holdings throughout the country held by new tenants to those in the possession of the landlords was as seven to two, and from his knowledge of Waterford the proportion there was not likely to be less. Therefore, of the 150 cases to be provided for 120 holdings were in the possession of new tenants and only thirty in the hands of the landlords. How were they to get land for those 120 men? They could not get it in the neighbouring counties. There would be 1,570 of the total number of 2,000 cases where the holdings were in possession of new tenants. By reason of the operation of the Land Act of 1903—£20,000,000 having been paid in advance up to the present time—one-seventh of those 1,570 new tenants, about 230 in number, had already got their vesting orders and had become new tenant purchasers under the Act of 1903. There would also probably be about 100 more who had got their vesting orders under previous Land Purchasing Acts, and there would, therefore, be at least 330 who had become new tenant purchasers and had got their vesting orders. They were men who had been notable as suitable for restoration. There might in parts of the country be no difficulty in dealing with the evicted tenants and in providing untenanted land for them. There might be some untenanted land in the midland counties, but there was none in the south of Ireland. There would therefore be, as the Act of 1903 operated, a greater number day by day of the new tenants becoming tenant purchasers, and, if they excluded them from the operations of the Bill, they could not possibly provide in Munster and in the south of Leinster for the evicted tenants whose farms had been acquired by new tenants purchasing them under the Land Act. This was a very large question, and, in his opinion, the Bill would be largely nugatory unless they dealt with the question by carrying out the intentions of the Government. His Amendment was really only a verbal one, because there was no distinction between the new tenant and the new tenant purchaser. Under the Bill as it stood they would be unable to prevent Lord Clanricarde, for instance, from defeating the Bill if he chose. He had no doubt that Lord Clanricarde had lost money by letting his land to these new tenants, and he could make them judicial tenants if he chose if he had not already done so. If he entered into an agreement with them after three months they became judicial tenants, and after that process had been gone through, Lord Clanricarde could easily convert them into second term tenants and make them buy at twenty-seven, thirty, or forty years purchase whatever the figure might be. He could put the maximum limit of value on the land, and at all events make them purchase at twenty-seven years purchase. Unless this Amendment was accepted at least 1,200 people would be disqualified from receiving the benefits of the Act because no distinction was made between the new tenants and the new tenant purchasers. The impression that he and his colleagues derived from the speeches made before this Bill was presented was that these new tenants, whether they were nominally tenant purchasers or only came within the description of new tenants, were, if they were willing to give up possession, included within the scope of the Bill. The general impression was that these men were to be compulsorily got rid of and moved elsewhere or to be given money in compensation if they did not take a farm of equal value elsewhere. That was the impression in Ireland, and that was the impression under which Nationalist Members voted for the Bill. From 1,200 to 1,570 of the 2,000 tenants who had been found suitable for reinstatement by the Estates Commissioners would be found to be unsuitable unless this Amendment were accepted. They denied the right of these new tenant purchasers to be in these farms. They were brought there by artificial means and in order to enable the landlords to extort higher prices from the existing tenants, and the Nationalist Party would always do all they could to secure the return of the tenants who had been evicted from their holdings. During the land war in Ireland there were no doubt "blacklegs," and he objected to these new tenants being converted into "new tenant purchasers."

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 22, after the word 'tenants,' to insert the words 'and new tenant purchasers.'"—(*Mr. O'Shee.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. T. M. HEALY thought the Attorney-General for Ireland would do well to consider some of the observations which had been made by his hon. friend. He would not say that this Amendment affected a large number of cases, but he thought that it hit a blot in the Bill which was well deserving of the consideration of the Government. It was one which would inflict no hardship on landlords. Certainly some Amendment of this kind was necessary, and he could not see how anybody connected with the landlord class could object to it. His only fear, however, was that the terms of the Amendment were not sufficiently wide, but if the Government were satisfied that a blot had been hit by his hon. friend he hoped the Attorney-General for Ireland would see his way, if he could not accept the Amendment as it now stood, to bring up a new clause to enable something of the kind to be done. He was sure that his hon. friend was entitled to the thanks of the Committee for the very able manner in which he had brought this subject before its attention.

*MR. BUTCHER said the speech of the hon. Member who moved this Amendment was an illuminating one, because it showed what false hopes had been raised in Ireland and the difficulties and the bitter disappointments which were likely to arise from this extremely ill-considered measure. The hon. Member for West Waterford had said that there was no real distinction between a new tenant and a tenant purchaser. The grounds that the hon. Member offered for that extraordinary statement were two. First, he gave instances in which persons who were never intended to get the benefit of the Purchase Act, such as agents and others, had purchased their holdings. He did not intend to dispute those instances, but anyhow there they were in legal possession. Next he urged that the tenant purchaser might have been in possession of his holding only for a year. But the hon. Gentleman did not tell them of cases in which the person he described as a "new tenant purchaser" might have been in possession of the holding for ten, fifteen, twenty, or even twenty-five years. Let them take the case of a man who had bought his holding ten or twenty years ago and had since been paying instalments to the State. Could his position be said to be merely that of a new tenant? First of all, he had acquired by this time a valuable property; he had paid a large sum of money in the form of terminable annuities, and at the end of a definite period he would hold the fee simple of the land without any further payment at all. He had already advanced so far along the road to complete ownership that if he were to put his holding up for sale he would realise a substantal price. The price so given would itself be conclusive proof that his interest as tenant purchaser was of a very different kind from that of a new tenant. His land was much more valuable, owing to the number of years during which he had paid the annuity. Besides, the holding had in many cases doubled in value, owing to the labour he had put into it and the improvements he had made. Yet they were told that these purchasers were in the position of ordinary tenants, and could fairly be put out of their holdings, and be forced to begin elsewhere *ab initio*.

MR. O'SHEE said that Subsection 5 of Clause 6 provided that the condition attaching to their present holdings should attach that to other holdings.

*MR. BUTCHER very much doubted whether that clause covered these cases. But, whether it did or not, he still maintained that the man who had paid his annuity to the State and had become an owner was in a totally different position from an ordinary tenant. The Bill had already one great blot which alone would prevent him from voting for it in its present shape—it gave power for the compulsory dispossession of new tenants. It was now proposed to do another and even greater injustice, to turn out owners who had acquired their land by an advance of public money. He trusted the Government would not lend themselves to such a wrong.

Mr. POWER (Waterford, W.) said that to his mind there was some ambiguity in the clause as it stood, and it was necessary to have words inserted to prevent misunderstanding. He presumed that the Estates Commissioners would naturally endeavour to procure farms for the people of a county in that county. That was the only way in which the difficulty could be met. He ventured to say that unless some such words as his hon. friend had suggested were inserted they would have people exempted from the operation of the Act who should naturally come under it.

Mr. CHERRY said that an interesting discussion had taken place and several points well worth considering had been raised. This was however not the first time the Government had considered the matter. There was an immense amount of difficulty in dealing with the question raised by the hon. Member for West Waterford. The hon. Member had used the phrase "new tenant purchasers." As he understood the hon. Member, there were two classes of tenants, those who had purchased their land and those who had merely signed agreements with their landlords to purchase but who by virtue of those agreements were considered owners. With regard to those who had purchased and were owners of the fee simple, their land was not tenanted land. It was technically untenanted land and therefore land which could be acquired compulsorily under the Bill. But there were two things which would prevent its being so acquired. First, Clause 6 distinctly stated that land in the immediate vicinity of the owner's dwelling should not be taken, and secondly—and this was a much more serious difficulty—that, if land was liable for an annuity, so long as it remained liable it could not be resold. So that before the Commissioners could take that land they must redeem the annuity, which would be a matter of enormous expense. He saw no way of dealing with cases of that kind at all. The hon. Member for North Louth had drawn attention to some cases where no doubt great hardships existed, but the Government would consider all cases of hardships brought to light and do all they could without violating the principle of the Bill to mitigate the hardship. The mover of the Amendment dealt with an entirely different class of tenant. A tenant was a tenant until the vesting order was granted, and then he became a purchaser, and it was exceedingly doubtful whether the land in that case could be taken from the tenant. But here a new difficulty arose as to whether a new tenant who entered into an agreement with his landlord to purchase did not pass out of the scope of the Bill altogether. He had however considered that matter, and had put down an Amendment to the effect that "a person shall be deemed to be a new tenant notwithstanding that he may have agreed to purchase his holding, provided that the holding has not been vested in him as a tenant purchaser." That would not give rise to the difficulty in regard to a man in occupation of land of which he had redeemed the greater portion. In the case of the other tenant whose term had not yet begun to run, he thought that tenant came within the definition of "owner," if not in the letter at least in the spirit of the Act.

Mr. T. M. HEALY said he would like to put to the hon. Member for Cambridge University and to the Government what he thought was the complete answer to the case of the tenant purchaser. No doubt, to the hon. Member for Cambridge University, who had shown such conspicuous fairness on this question, it did seem at the start a strong thing to say that a man who had bought the land, though he was a grabber or planter, should be disturbed in his possession as though he was an ordinary tenant of the landlord. But, if they considered the case, it was not so. It was a hardship to interfere between landlord and tenant, because there they interfered between the contractor and the contractee—they interfered with private rights. But if the State handsomely came forward, as it had done, and took upon itself the burdensomeness and onerousness of being the landlord, and was willing to make an advance, surely the State had acquired, in regard to a man in that position, a right which it would not have in regard to a man in the position of a free contractor. To interfere with the tenant purchasers, to whom the State had made a handsome advance, and who had got the right by reason of the money and machinery of the State, aye, and the work of Members below the gangway who for the last twenty-five years had been fighting their battle for them to get them into that position, was much more reasonable than to interfere with men who had remained outside the State limits or State control. The man who had purchased a farm with the aid of State money was not possessed of the fee simple; he became a child or *protégé* of the State, which asserted rights over him which it would be most unfair to assert over the ordinary tenant from year to year; he had acquired land not by the expenditure of his own money, but through the sacrifice of his fellow-countrymen and the bounty and generosity of the State. The legal difficulty which the Attorney-General had pointed out with reference to the annuity could be very easily got rid of. The question was whether it was right and reasonable to remove it. It was greatly to their credit that a number of landlords who had evicted tenants in the past had shown to the Estates Commissioners that they were willing to let bygones be bygones and to facilitate the re-introduction of these men to their holdings, and he believed it would facilitate the working of this measure if that spirit were properly recognised. They had Lord Lansdowne and Lord Massereene and landlords of that type who desired to let bygones be bygones; and surely they were not to speak in the same breath of a man like Lord Lansdowne and a man like Lord Clanricarde. One was anxious to let bygones be bygones; the other was still waving the black flag. Of the whole string of landlords, sixteen out of eighteen, or fourteen out of sixteen—he did not know the exact number—were desirous of having peace, and only one or two of the ragged edge were willing to continue contention. He knew that the spirit of the Government was reasonable, and he fully recognised that the Attorney-General had distinguished himself by the acuteness as well as the sympathy he had shown in the course of the debate. This case ought not to be dealt with on the ground of a technical objection, and the Government should consider it as a whole. He thoroughly believed that these new tenants, if they got a decent offer, if the way were made easy for them, would willingly give up their holdings, and for his part he would not haggle with them about terms. Let them have peace. That was what they wanted, and surely if peace were the real consideration with both parties, it should not be difficult to frame some Amendment to get over what he admitted, as the law now stood, was the unanswerable argument of the learned Attorney-General.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said that no one who had followed the discussion could be in the least surprised at the answer of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, and he had no doubt that they would be told afterwards that the Government had climbed down altogether. Speaking some few days ago in another place a member of the Government said that he, for one, would be no party, nor would His Majesty's Government, to the removal by compulsion of any new tenant who was a *bona fide* farmer. The Chief Secretary for Ireland, in his Second Reading speech, as the hon. Member for West Waterford had said, had declared that all the "planters," whether *bona fide* farmers or not, were to get the order to go; and the hon. Member had said that of course it would be a disappointment if it was now found that there was to be a distinction as regarded any of these new tenants. Although that was undoubtedly the impression left on the House, and the impression that was created throughout Ireland by the speech of the right hon. Gentleman on the Second Reading, he had altered the tone of his remarks since the statement by Lord Crewe in another place; because, speaking from his place in that House, the other evening, the right hon. Gentleman had said that he entirely agreed with that statement and that he also, for one, would be no party, nor would His Majesty's Government, to the compulsory removal of any of these new tenants who had shown a *bona fide* desire and intention to work their holdings as farms. This Amendment afforded an excellent opportunity for bringing to a test the reality and sincerity of that profession, because it was now proposed to apply compulsion not merely to the new tenant but to the man who, having been a new tenant, had given the very best indication of his desire to keep his place as a farmer by becoming the purchasing owner of the land under the Act of 1903, or some antecedent measure of the same kind. He could not conceive any better proof a new tenant could give than by becoming the purchasing owner, and thus turning himself from the occupier, who could go out on six months notice, into that of occupying owner who was to remain until he could sell the whole thing to some new owner. Therefore, if there was any truth or reality in what the Chief Secretary had said, in regard to the views expressed in another place by Lord Crewe, that he and his Government would be no party to the removal against their will of new tenants who were *bona fide* farmers anxious to retain their farms, then all he could say was that the right hon. Gentleman could be no party in any shape or form to this Amendment of the hon. Member for West Waterford, who had shown a very keen appreciation of the difficulty of this measure, and a very apt knowledge of the situation in Ireland as regarded the landlords and evicted tenants. The hon. Member had said truly that these tenants had been in possession since long before 1901.

Mr. O'SHEE: Some of them.

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL saw that that was the hon. Gentleman's statement, however he might wish to modify it, and he could only deal with what the hon. Gentleman had said, namely, that these tenant purchasers who were now to be summarily removed were, to his own knowledge, in possession long before 1901. What better proof could there be of the desire of these men to retain their holdings as farms than the fact that they had used them so many years as farms, and had remained so many years in possession, having changed their position from that of a yearly tenant to that of purchasing owner subject to the purchaser's small annuity? If this Amendment was accepted, it would be a deliberate and direct violation of the pledge so honourably given in the other House by Lord Crewe, supported as it was by the plain, straightforward, and deliberate language of the Chief Secretary. He should have thought that would have been a sufficient answer; but the Attorney-General had not touched upon that point, his only reply being that there were legal difficulties in the way. There were other difficulties which to him had a much more important bearing, and they were difficulties of honour and solemn undertakings and pledges given as deliberate expressions of the intentions of the Government in that House and elsewhere. The hon. Member for West Waterford sought to include within the definition of new tenants, tenants who had changed their position into that of purchasing owners. That, he submitted would be a distinct violation of the pledges given by Lord Crewe in the House of Lords. It was said that agents should not become purchasing owners: why not? Under the Acts of 1881 and 1870 agents who held farms were allowed to be treated as persons entitled to compensation when they were disturbed. Until that day he had never heard any complaint made against a man simply because in addition to being a farmer he happened to collect the rents for his principal.

Mr. T. M. HEALY: No such complaint has been made.

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL said there appeared to be a difference of opinion upon that point even amongst the Nationalist Party.

Mr. T. M. HEALY: There is no difference of opinion amongst us.

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL said the matter under discussion was one of the most important, short of leading principles, that had come up for consideration. The Attorney-General had explained that the object of this proposal was to bring under the definition of ordinary new tenants——

The DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member has already stated what the Attorney-General said, and we cannot now have the whole matter repeated because the Chief Secretary has come in.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said that all he desired to say was that to include in the definition of new tenants those tenants who had become purchasers, and had changed their position to that of purchasing owners, would be a direct and distinct violation of the pledge given by Lord Crewe and the right hon. Gentleman opposite, that in the case of a really *bona fide* farmer there was no intention to remove him. The right hon. Gentleman had said that there were legal difficulties in the way and that he would be quite prepared to consider with favour some Amendment that would enable those tenants who had signed agreements——

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: We cannot have the Attorney-General's speech delivered over again for the benefit of the Chief Secretary for Ireland.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said there must be some mistake, because he was not repeating this for the benefit of the Chief Secretary.

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: The right hon. Gentleman dealt with the arguments of the Attorney-General some time ago.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL: Not on this particular point.

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: You have answered him already on the very points you are dealing with now.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said the Deputy-Chairman was under a complete misapprehension, because he had not yet approached the second branch of this question, which had been dealt with by the right hon. Member, namely, the case of those tenants who had not yet become purchasing owners, but had signed agreements. He had said that they were in a different position, and that he would be quite prepared to accept some Amendment which would place them as new tenants within the ambit of the Act. He admitted that there was something to be said in favour of including within this section tenants who had signed agreements to purchase since the introduction of this Bill. But it would be a breach of an undertaking which had been given in that House to apply these compulsory powers to tenants who had signed agreements to purchase some years ago, and had not yet become owners owing to delay in the Estates Commissioners' office and to want of funds.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG objected strongly to the Amendment on the ground of the pledges given by the Nationalist Party in 1903. It was a monstrous proposal, and he asked the Committee to reject it. They had been told that only in a few cases would these compulsory powers be used for the purpose of expropriating new tenants, but this Amendment did not confirm that view. Having regard to the Act of 1903, and the pledges which were given before the passing of that measure, it would be a gross breach of the bargain then made. They knew that the Attorney-General was unable to accept any Amendment with regard to those who had actually completed their purchases, and were in possession of their farms. If these so-called new tenants who had signed agreements to purchase in good faith, before there was any question of this Bill, were made subject to the provisions of this section, there would be an end to all bargains and pledges in that House. He had frequently stated and had never been contradicted, that when the Act of 1903 was passed there was no intention on the part of the Nationalist Members to ask for the expropriation of the new tenants. They said they would be perfectly content if powers were given to the Land Court to reinstate those unfortunate people who had been evicted, and especially those who had been evicted during the land war. Practically 95 per cent. had been reinstated, and yet hon. Members below the gangway asked that the men in possession should be asked to go out in favour of persons who had been evicted, perhaps, twenty-five years ago. Those evicted tenants had lost all connection with the districts in which they once lived, and probably they did not care whether they were reinstated there or somewhere else. It was a monstrous proposal, and he hoped the Committee would reject it.

Mr. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.) said he understood the Attorney-General to say that his objection to the Amendment was that the Government, if it were accepted, would have to deal with the cases of planters who had purchased under any of the Land Purchase Acts, and that that would involve such a large financial transaction that the Treasury would never consent to it. He knew of cases himself where tenants had got back into farms from which they were evicted and where a difficulty existed in making them tenant purchasers, because the person who purchased previously had not repaid the full purchase money to the Treasury. He could not understand why that difficulty should come in. If the original price of a holding was £1,000, and £250 had already been repaid to the Treasury in respect of the sinking fund portion of the annuity, leaving £750 still outstanding, where did the difficulty come in of the Treasury giving to the Estates Commissioners the £750 for the purpose of buying out the existing planter-purchaser, when the next day the Treasury would be getting back the same amount of money from the evicted tenant whom the Estates Commissioners proposed to reinstate in the holding? He really thought it was trifling with the House of Commons and the tenants of Ireland for the Attorney-General to put forward such an argument. The objection of Unionist Members was that it would be a monstrous thing to remove a farmer who had purchased. A stranger listening to their speeches would suppose that the planters were *bona fide* farmers. As a matter of fact, some of the planters who were put in at the time of the Plan of Campaign were shoemakers. If the hon. and learned Gentleman wanted more information as to cobblers and others who had been put into farms when the landlords could not get *bona fide* tenants, he should ask the hon. Member for South Tyrone, who was one of those who started the Irish Land Trust Company to finance them. The funds were collected mainly from English landlords who wanted to stave off the land legislation with which they were now face to face. The hon. Member for North Armagh had said that these planters were bone of their bone and flesh of their flesh. He should have thought that the hon. Member would have had more respect for himself than to be anxious to make the House of Commons understand that he claimed kinship with these men. The hon. Member knew that most of these men were advertised for, and that they were got in the slums of the Ulster towns. [Cries of "Oh."] The hon. Member for South Tyrone would acknowledge that, and he knew more about it than the hon. Member for North Armagh. The hon. Member for South Tyrone had done more for Irish landlords and landlordism than the hon. Member for North Armagh would be able to do if he lived to the age of Methuselah. [An Hon. Member: He is making up for it now.] Yes, he was making up for it now. The hon. Member for North Armagh had sold his estate, and had put into his pocket, through the action of the wounded soldiers of the land war, more than thirty-three years purchase of the net income.

The DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is not speaking to the Amendment. It must be remembered that if we go into all these details we will never make progress.

Mr. KILBRIDE said that, if the Chief Secretary thought that the Bill as it stood, and without the acceptance of the Amendment or some modification of it, would settle for ever the evicted tenants question, he would find himself mistaken. The Chief Secretary knew the extreme landlords sufficiently well to know that if any loopholes were left, they would avail themselves of them for the purpose of defeating his object. He hoped, therefore, the Government would consider the Amendment, either in its present or some other form.

Mr. BIRRELL said that he and his right hon. and learned friend were in accord as to the line to be taken on this subject, and he was prepared to repeat what he understood the Attorney-General had already said. They were not prepared to throw open again the estates of these planters, who might have become purchasers under the Act of 1903. He dared say that a good deal might be said on both sides, but on the whole they were of the opinion that, after the great sacrifice made and the agreements arrived at, it would be undesirable to take away the land from those who had become possessors under the Act of 1903. He certainly thought when their cases came to be reviewed under the terms of the Bill, the Estate Commissioners would not feel themselves justified in seeking to evict those planters who had become purchasers of their holdings. He had always felt that there were two classes of planters, those who were *bona fide* farmers and had shown their interest in the soil and their desire to remain on it, and to become purchasers under the Act, and those with whom his hon friend beside him (the Vice-President of the Board of Agriculture for Ireland) had at some period of his life, a closer connection than now, and who came and took possession, not so much because they wanted to do so as because other people wanted them there in order to carry on a contest which they hoped was now coming to a conclusion. He was disposed to think that in those cases and where the planters had shown their *bona fides*, their good faith and their desire to remain on the land for the purpose of making it a marketable commodity, even if they had not become purchasers under the Act, the Estate Commissioners would exercise their discretion, and would not interfere with them. He was not, therefore, disposed to interfere with the decision which the Attorney-General had arrived at in the matter. His right hon. friend had, he believed, indicated a willingness to consider the cases of the planters who had only signed agreements and had not obtained their vesting orders. The question was obviously one as to what date should be inserted in the clause, and the matter would receive the attention of his right hon. friend the Attorney-General and himself. They were not prepared, however, to accept the Amendment in the form presented.

MR. WALTER LONG said that he gathered that the Attorney-General did not go quite so far as the Chief Secretary had suggested. He understood that the Attorney-General had promised that he would consider an Amendment in regard to the cases in which vesting orders had not been made. He would appeal to the Chief Secretary. What argument was there that applied to the case of those who had obtained their vesting orders which did not equally apply to those who had not obtained them merely because the State had been unable to find the necessary money? It was not due to any want of willingness on their part or on the part of the landlord that the vesting orders had not been made; it was due solely to the fact that the State had not been able to find the money necessary to complete the purchase. The Chief Secretary had said that he rejected the Amendment in its main part because the tenants, by entering into purchasing arrangements, had given the strongest proof of their *bona fide* desire to be connected with the land and to remain on their holdings. There was no difference whatever between the proof given by the man whose vesting had taken place and the man whose vesting order had not been issued. The latter was not a bit less willing, nor had he shown any less desire than the former. If the right hon. Gentleman based his opposition to the Amendment on the ground that the purchasing tenants had given the strongest proof of their desire to be permanently connected with the land of which they were the occupiers and cultivators, he could not justify his refusal to consider the cases of men who had equally done everything they could to show the same desire and expose them to the possibility of displacement when the State had been the only stay in the operations. They were not fighting a Party question in any sense, and the history of the agrarian question as written in this House alone must tell the most casual student that, when they were dealing with it, they were on very different ground, and that it was almost impossible for anyone to tell what would follow from the best conceived and best worked out legislation. They believed that the Government were opening up difficulties, not for themselves—that was a matter it was not for them to look after; it was no business of theirs if the Government got into difficulty; on the contrary, it was their business to see they did get into difficulties—but they were opening up difficulties in regard to the general situation of the agrarian question in Ireland, and the step they were taking would bring in its train the gravest difficulties to the people in Ireland interested in the settlement of the land question. There was no distinction whatever between the position of the Irish tenant who had had the vesting order which made him the actual owner of his farm and the position of the tenant who had come to an agreement with his landlord, who had done everything he could to become the purchaser of his farm, who was sitting under conditions which led him to believe he was to be the purchaser, and yet who had not received his vesting order. There had been £50,000,000 of sales in Ireland, of which only £20,000,000 odd had been paid for, and it was in respect of all these cases in which vesting orders had not been issued that it was proposed to expose the new tenants to expulsion. Whilst they refused to interfere with the man who had had his vesting order, they were going to disturb the man who had given the same proof of his desire to be permanently connected with the land he occupied, but who had not been able to acquire possession because the money had not been forthcoming to enable the order to issue. He said without hesitation that whilst the decision of the Government in regard to the major part of the Amendment was sound and one which the whole House ought to support in the interests of peace, their promise to re-open the cases where vesting orders had not been issued would create difficulties for the Government and their supporters and for those who would have to pay for the blunder of the Government. It must be remembered that those who lived in Ireland had to pay the price of the blunders of the Government.

Mr. MOORE wished to associate himself with the speech of the right hon. Gentleman. The hon. Member who had spoken before said that he had spent the greater part of his life in preventing "planters," or "grabbers" from getting possession of the land. In saying that the hon. Member was going against the leaders of his own Party, who said in that 1903 they would not consent to any measure or step which would expropriate these men.

Mr. O'SHEE said that what he had done was done after the landlords had broken their part of the compact.

Mr. MOORE said he understood that the hon. Member had been engaged in a lifelong exploit in this regard, but now the hon. Gentleman seemed to be going quite contrary to the declarations of his leaders. [A Nationalist Member: Who is your leader, Moore?] He took it rather as a compliment that he was never able to address the House without interruption. The hon. Member seemed to think that this was a trivial Amendment, but there was no such person known to the law as a "new tenant purchaser." The moment a man became a purchaser he ceased to be a tenant, and the phrase "a new tenant purchaser" was something which the hon. Gentleman had adopted from the *Freeman's Journal.* A man could not be at the same time the tenant and the purchaser of a holding. He objected to the nomenclature which the hon. Member used in regard to this class of tenant, because if a man had purchased his land, or even if he had only signed a contract for the purchase of his land, he was in equity the owner of that land, although perhaps the contract had not been completed. There were only two cases before the House, namely, those of men who had purchased their land and those who were tenants, and the attempt of the hon. Member for West Waterford to create a third class must fail. It would be an intolerable thing if a man had within the last three years become a party to an agreement and paid money upon it that he should be made the subject of a statutory and compulsory eviction. Therefore the Attorney-General for Ireland was only doing what was honest and honourable when he said that new tenant purchasers in the sense in which those words were used by the hon. Member for Waterford were not to be expropriated from their holdings. There was, he repeated, no such term as "new tenant purchaser," but he hoped that the Chief Secretary would put an

Amendment in the Bill to the effect, that when they were dealing with untenanted land which was subject to an annuity to the Land Commissioners it should not be interfered with. That, however, was a subject for the Report stage. For all he knew, the action of the Estates Commissioners, or rather the action of the majority of the Estates Commissioners, might have been caused by the pressure which the hon. Member for Waterford boasted he had exercised during his lifetime. [Mr. BIRRELL dissented.] The Chief Secretary deprecated that statement, and he dared say that without consulting his experts he would continue to deprecate it ; but they on that side were in a position in which they were free to criticise ; and when an hon. Member said that for a quarter of a century he had been engaged in exercising pressure to bring this state of things about they did not know what the pressure to which he alluded might be. He protested against the idea, however, that when a man was not a tenant, and in equity was the possessor of the property and in equity was the purchaser of it, the Government of the day, in order to suit the Party exigencies of hon. Members below the gangway, were going to shoot him out altogether. What was he if he was neither a purchaser nor a tenant ? And yet it was said that a man in this position who had been in possession for three or four years was to be shot out. The Government to be logical should treat him as a purchaser if an agreement was signed. He had had the pleasure of listening to the speech of an hon. Gentleman who said he was an evicted tenant. He did not complain of the references of the hon. Member to himself, or of the comparisons he made between the political records of the hon. Member for South Tyrone and himself. He had sat for thirteen years behind the hon. Member for South Tyrone, who was now in a position in the present Government, and then the hon. Member protested not against the class of "planter" who had been described by the Chief Secretary as being dispossessed, but against the people who had risked their lives and their fortunes and who had come down to take possession of an evicted farm being dealt with.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) called attention to the fact that in the year 1894 he moved the clause which was supported by the hon. Member's leader to reinstate these evicted tenants.

MR. MOORE did not know what that statement had to do with the matter. They did not object to the reinstatement of evicted tenants, but to the displacement of "planters," as they were affectionately called by hon. Members below the gangway. The hon. Member got up in those days and protested against any steps being taken against those new tenants. He said it would be an injustice, and if it was an injustice in 1894, what was it now when these "planters" had had children who had grown up, and who had been given in marriage, and who had been selling and purchasing land and borrowing money on their farms ? The only difference was that in those days the hon. Member was elected by a Nationalist majority, instead of as now being elected by a Unionist majority. He would not have introduced this topic, but for the hon. Member's contrast of their political records. He had introduced a personal comparison between himself and the hon. Gentleman, and he thought it was unfortunate that these personal matters should be introduced. This topic, however, was introduced by the hon. Gentleman's ally the hon. Member for Kildare.

THE CHAIRMAN said he did not quite see the relevance of these remarks upon this sub-section, which merely dealt with the question of finding land for new tenants.

MR. MOORE said he might be wrong, but he thought they were discussing the Amendment of the hon. Member for West Waterford which introduced the words "new tenant purchasers" upon which the Government had made a very important declaration. He would not, however, say anything more on the personal matter; he was led into his references by the speech of the hon. Gentleman who had previously spoken. Speaking generally, however, he thought it was an unfortunate thing that the position of Vice-President of the Irish

Department of Agriculture, which the hon. Member for South Tyrone now occupied, should cease to be a non-political appointment, and that the occupant of the office should have a seat in that House. While he congratulated the Government on the unusual talent they had shown in coming half way towards what was right and fair, he still said it was an unfortunate thing that they should have gone so far in the concessions which they had made to hon. Members below the gangway.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND said he did not intend to enter into the general arguments of this Amendment. He had been listening to speeches from the hon. and learned Member now for some time with reference to this Bill, and he had not heard one speech from him in which he did not make very grave insinuations and accusations against the Estates Commissioners and against hon. Members for Ireland sitting below the gangway. His accusations had amounted to this, that they had been bringing improper pressure of one sort or another to bear upon the Estates Commissioners, and the insinuations had been to the effect that the Estates Commissioners had been, or were likely to be, moved by this improper pressure. The House knew that two of the Estates Commissioners held their office by tenure of an insecure character, and that they could be removed from office at the pleasure of the executive of the Government of the day. He had risen for the purpose of denying that they had ever directly or indirectly sought to bring any pressure whatever to bear upon any of the Estates Commissioners, and he was quite convinced, although it was not his habit to defend officials of the British Government in Ireland, that those gentlemen were not susceptible to pressure of this kind. But he had to say that the hon. Member himself had attempted to bring most improper pressure to bear upon one of these Commissioners. He had to say that the hon. and learned Member himself had addressed a letter to one of these Commissioners containing threats of what would happen to him if he pursued his present course of action when a change of Government took place. The writing of that letter was a most improper proceeding.

Mr. MOORE, rising to a point of order, said he had written a letter to one of the Commissioners in reference to a letter marked "private." Would the whole correspondence be read?

Mr. JOHN REDMOND said the letter to which he was alluding was not marked private, and if he was not mistaken it contained the phrase that the gentleman to whom it was written might show it to anyone he liked. That letter, written to a man whose tenure of office was insecure, who held his office at the pleasure of the Government of the day, threatened this official that if he pursued his present course, in accordance with what he held to be his duty, he would be visited with pains and penalties when next the Tory Government came into office. Now, what about improper pressure brought upon these gentlemen? He had not got the letter, but it was in the possession of a Member of the House, and if his statement was challenged he called upon that Gentleman to read it.

Mr. MOORE said that, as he was the Member attacked he should say—as far as he remembered at any rate—he received a letter from one of the Estates Commissioners, and that was marked "private." He could not state the contents of it now unless he was authorised to do so, and he would not do so. Let any hon. Member authorise him to state what he received from him. He then wrote a letter in which he expressed his opinion and stated that he could show it to whom he liked. It was in marked contradistinction of the document marked "private." He received another letter—he did not think it was marked "private"—and he said he had written in consequence of the contents of the first letter. He had no objection to it being published, but he would not discuss it piecemeal. As to saying that he threatened this gentleman, he said that there should be an inquiry, and as far as he and his friends were concerned—he had no right to speak for a Tory Government—they would be delighted to have an inquiry as soon as they had the power.

*The CHAIRMAN said this was a purely personal matter which appeared hardly relevant to this discussion.

MR. JOHN REDMOND, with great respect, although not intending to contest the point with the Chair, expressed the view that it was not a purely personal question. An accusation had been made against him and his friends of bringing improper pressure to bear upon the Commissioners, and there had been an inneundo that these Commissioners had been influenced by that improper pressure. He answered that by denying the accusation against him and his hon. friends and by making a specific allegation that threats of this character were held out in a letter; and he now called for that letter to be read He had not the letter, but it was in the hands of an hon. Gentleman on the Treasury Bench, and he called on the hon. Gentleman to read it.

*THE CHAIRMAN: My point is that I doubt if this is an occasion on which this matter is relevant.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I most respectfully say that this is a question as to whether the Estates Commissioners are to be trusted with the discretion of applying compulsion in certain cases to the planters of Ireland. The whole question turns on whether they are deserving of this discretion; and it is strictly relevant to that to consider whether they have yielded to improper pressure from these Benches, and it is strictly relevant upon that question whether improper threats have been held out from other quarters. Again I call for the production of that letter.

MR. MOORE rose simultaneously with Mr. RUSSELL.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. Member for North Armagh rise to a point of order?

MR. MOORE: Yes, Sir. I am perfectly willing to have the letter read if that of Commissioner Bailey is also read.

*THE CHAIRMAN: This appears to have arisen out of some charges made when I was not here, and perhaps it would be better, if the hon. Member for Waterford wishes that the letter should be read, to have it read.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: It is well known that I am a very old friend of the Commissioner assailed in this correspondence; and before I left Ireland on Sunday Mr. Bailey placed in my hands this letter, leaving it entirely to my discretion to use it or not. I have been challenged to read it, and I think I ought to reply to that challenge. [Cries of "Read the whole correspondence."]

MR. WALTER LONG: I rise to a point of order. I wish to ask you, Sir, whether it is within the competence of an hon. Member to read a portion of correspondence the whole of which he has not got with him, and of which he only proposes to read one letter.

*THE CHAIRMAN: A particular letter has been asked for, and it may be read; but it is not in my power to compel the production of the whole correspondence.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL, proceeding, said that in March, 1907, the hon. Member for East Down put a question to the Chief Secretary. [Cries of "That is not the letter."] It was a statement preparatory to the reading of the letter.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I rise to a point of order. I wish to know whether, after the consent of the Chairman has been given for a certain letter to be read, it is competent for the hon. Member who has offered to read it to make a speech?

*THE CHAIRMAN: There is no such intention I think.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: The hon. Member for East Down put a question in the House of Commons to the Chief Secretary in March, as to the delay in making land purchase advances. After the answer was given, the hon. Member for North Armagh put as a supplementary question, "Is the continual absence of Mr. Commissioner Bailey a cause of the delay?" The Speaker ruled the question out of order. Mr. Bailey's attention was called to the matter, and he wrote to the Chief Secretary on the subject, and also to the hon. Member for North Armagh. He pointed out that during the preceding twelve months he had not taken more than half the vacation to which he was entitled. [Cries of "Read the letter."] Mr. Bailey received the following letter from the Member for North Armagh :—

"Belfast,
19*th March*, 1907.

"Dear Bailey—

["We want Bailey's letter."] I have received the Chairman's permission to read this letter.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I must appeal to hon. Members to keep order. I have given permission for this letter tobe read.

SIR F. BANBURY: On a point of order, am I not right in thinking that the letter which the Member for Waterford called for was the letter written by Mr. Bailey. [Cries of "No."]

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. Member is going to read the letter asked for and which I said could be read. ["Which letter?"] Order, order! I must appeal to Members of the Committee not to keep interrupting.

MAJOR SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby): On a point of order. You, Sir, having called on the hon. Member to address the Committee, is he not entitled to say anything or read anything he pleases, provided he is within the rules of order?

*THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly, he is entitled to do anything within the rules of order.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL then continued reading the letter as follows:—

"You were appointed by a Unionist Government to see fair play between Wrench and Finucane, and you have sold the pass on every occasion. The first thing my colleagues and I will do when we come back, which will not be far off, will be to press for an inquiry into the working of your department. You can destroy your evidence now, and show this to whom you please." [Interruption.]

*THE CHAIRMAN: I must appeal to hon. Members to keep quiet.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Who is intimidating now?

MR. WALTER LONG said he regretted that a letter which formed a portion of a correspondence should have been read without the production of the other letters, and upon an occasion when, under the Order made by the Government, the Opposition were precluded from taking the only course that in the circumstances would have been possible—namely, moving the adjournment of the debate. A member of the Government had been able with marvellous celerity to produce the complement to the speech of the Member for Waterford, and he had done so without venturing to produce the correspondence of which it formed part, and under the protection of the Order to which he had already referred. But for this Order the Opposition would certainly have moved the adjournment of the debate to mark what they considered as, not only irregular, but as the most remarkable course ever taken by a member of a Government. ["Oh, oh."]

MR. MOORE said he hoped the Committee would not deny him the right of making a personal explanation. Now that Mr. Bailey had accommodated his friend the Member for South Tyrone with a sample of his own letter, he was released from the obligation of the word "private" put upon it. Mr. Bailey's letter was unsolicited and uncalled for. It contained a complaint that he had asked about Mr. Bailey's apparent neglect of his duties. He had asked why he was always to be seen at Westminster in company with hon. Members below the gangway, considering the judicial position he had in Ireland. Mr. Bailey's letter contained a statement which he regarded as an attack on Mr. Wrench. Mr. Bailey did not mention Mr. Wrench's name, but he said he had been in closer and longer attendance than his own colleagues, by whom he understood Mr. Wrench to be meant. [NATIONALIST cries of "Oh."] Who else was there? He thought it was a most disloyal and unfair attack of one colleague in a Government office on another colleague, and he wrote to Mr. Bailey that he resented his marking his letter "private," and took the opportunity of saying that his own letter was not private. It might have been an imprudent letter, but he was not ashamed of it, and he would do it again if he thought a friend of his was unfairly attacked. In an acknowledgment which he wrote he said he should never have written the letter to him had he not unfairly attacked his own colleague, Mr. Wrench. That letter also was probably in the possession of the hon. Member for South Tyrone, so let him read that letter as well.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I need hardly say that I am not going to add anything to the controversy which has arisen. Unfortunately I was not here in the earlier stages, but I understand from my right hon. friend near me that the hon. Gentleman opposite has read a letter to a member of the Estates Commission. I am not going to express an opinion until I have fuller information as to whether that letter should have been read or not, but of this I am quite clear, that the letter should not be read alone. It is a perfectly well understood and universally accepted rule of the House that if a Minister of the Crown reads a letter the whole correspondence should be laid on the Table. That is not only, so far as I am aware, the settled practice of the House, but it is obviously fair in the present situation. It may be—for I know nothing of the controversy—that when those letters are laid on the Table my hon. and learned friend behind me may have reason to regret that I asked for it. I do not know but at all events let us have the whole thing before us. I am sure the hon. Gentleman opposite and the Government will agree that the whole correspondence should be printed and laid on the Table as a Parliamentary Paper.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL said he was afraid that the preface he gave to the letter was imperfectly heard on account of so much interruption. He agreed with what the Leader of the Opposition had said. He would communicate with Mr. Bailey, and if he had the original letter it would be produced.

An HON. MEMBER: Moore has it.

Mr. MOORE: I will produce it.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 87; Noes, 298. (Division List No. 302.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ambrose, Robert
Baring, Capt. Hn. G(Winchester)
Barnes, G. N.
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Clancy, John Joseph
Clynes, J. R.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Devlin, Joseph
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Farrell, James Patrick
Field, William
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hudson, Walter
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lundon, W.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Mooney, J. J.
Murnaghan, George
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, M.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Richards, T. F. (Wolverhampton
Richardson, A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Steadman, W. C.
Thorne, William
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Walsh, Stephen
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Wardle, George J.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel

Tellers for the Ayes—Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashley, W. W.
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Balfour, Rt Hn A. J. (City Lond.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J H (Essex, Romf'rd)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brigg, John
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Cameron, Robert
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J (S. Pancras, W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dobson, Thomas W.
Doughty, Sir George
Duckworth, James
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fell, Arthur
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Findlay, Alexander
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibb, James (Harro W.)
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe
Hervey, F. W. F (Bury S. Edmd's
Higham, John Sharp
Hills, J. W.
Hobart, Sir Robert
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Liddell, Henry
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. M (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Moore, William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N (Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.

Rendall, Athelstan
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A. H.(Ashton-und.-Lyne
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, SirEdward (Salisbury
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Thomson, W Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Ure, Alexander
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, RtHnE(Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, A.Stanley(York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B.Stuart-

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

And, it being after half-past Ten of the clock, the Chairman proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of 22nd July, successively to put forthwith the Questions necessary to dispose ot the business to be concluded.

Question put, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 341; Noes, 98. (Division List No. 303.)

AYES.

Abraham,William(Cork,N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen,A.Acland(Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey (Isleof Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,SirJ Williams(Dev'np'rt)
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,SirJH(Essex,R'mf'rd)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,RtHnRichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherey, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.P'ncr's,W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J.(Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar,Sir J. A.(Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson,W.H.(S.Pancras,N
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter

Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col Alan Hereford,S.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon,Rt Hn SirWBrampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Herbert, T. Arnold(Wycombe
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnavonsh.)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb,Edmund G.(Leominster
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner,JamesCarriageRushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea,Hugh Cecil (StPancras,E)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy(Essex,Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes

Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah(Down,S.
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal,E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall(Lincoln
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd(Carmarthen
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN(D'ncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary,Md
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W.D.(Colchester)
Pearson,W.H.M.(Suffolk, Eye
Philipps, Col.Ivor.(S'thampton
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E.(Edinb'gh,Central)
Price,RobertJohn(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley,W.E.B.(BradfordE.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'

Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A. H.(Asht'n-und'r-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley,Hn.A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thompson,J W H(Somerset, E.
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward,John(Stoke-upon-Trent
Wardle. George J.
Wason,Rt HnE(Clackmannan
Wason,JohnCathcart(Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.

Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick(Meath,North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax
Whittaker, SirThomasPalmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson,J.W.(Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St.Pancras, S.)
Wilson,W.T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.SirH
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring,CptHn.G.(Winchester)
Barrie,H.T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beach,Hn.MichaelHughHicks
Beckett, Hon.Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt.Hn.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R.(Marylebone,E.)
Chamberlain,RtHnJ.A.(Worc
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett,A.Cameron(Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,CharlesCurtis(Antrim,S
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gretton, John
Hardy,Laurence (Kent,Ashf'd
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hervey,F.W.F.(B'ryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon Slaney,Rt.Hn.Col.W
King, Sir Hen. Seymour (Hull
Lambton, Hon. Fredk. Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood,Rt.Hon.Lt.-Cl.A.R
Long, Col. Chas.W.(Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walt.(Dublin,S)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nield, Herbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Fredk. Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staffs.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson,A.Stanl'y,(York, E.R.
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon.C.B.Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Clause 2:—

Verbal Amendment made.

Question put, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 346; Noes, 104. (Division List No. 304.)

AYES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen,A.Acland(Christchurch)
Allen,Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker,Joseph A.(Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey(Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,SirJ.Williams(Devonprt
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romfrd
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brodie, H. C.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,RtHnRichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph

Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(SPancrasW
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J.(Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William, J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Sir J.A.(Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.P'ncr's N.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan,C. (Barrow-in Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis, J.
Gurdon,Rt.Hn.SirW.Br'mpt'n
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope,W. Bateman (Som'set N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carn'rv'nshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G.(Leominster
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil St.Pancras,E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy(Essex,Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah(Down,S.
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal,E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield,H.Rendall(Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan,J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Donc'str
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien,Kendal(Tippera'yMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W.D.(Colchester)
Pearson,W.H.M.(Suffolk,Eye)
Philipps,Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price,C.E.(Edinburgh,Central
Price,RobertJohn(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea,Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond,John E.(Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T.F. (Wolver'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradfrd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott,A.H.(AshtonunderLyne
Sears, J. E.

Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowdon, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thompson, J. W. H. (S'm'rs't, E.
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Rt Hn E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancres, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher. Rt. Hn. Sir H
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. G. (City Lon,
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (W'ch'ter)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervasse
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt Hon. Victor C. W
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hon J. A. (Wor
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gretton, John
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bu'y S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt Hon Col. W.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn Lt.-Col. A. R
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nield, Herbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormski'k
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Whereupon the CHAIRMAN left the Chair to make his Report to the House. Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) [EXPENSES].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys provided by Parliament, of expenses incurred and compensation payable by the Estates Commissioners in relation to land acquired under any Act of the present session, to facilitate the provision of land for certain Evicted Tenants in Ireland, and for other purposes connected therewith, and to authorise the National Debt Commissioners to make advances to the Land Commission for certain purposes of such Act."—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

And, it being after half-past Ten of the clock, the CHAIRMAN proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of 22nd July, to put forthwith the Question.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 331; Noes, 94. (Division List No. 305.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (D'v'np'rt
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, R'mf'rd
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brodie, H. C.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Rich'rd Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. P'ncr's, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Suss'x, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dickins'n, W. H. (St. P'ncr's, N.)
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-F'rn'ss)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan (H'r'f'rd, S.)
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone. Rt. Hon. H'rb't Jn.
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Rt. Hon. Sir W. B.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Right Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W. Bateman (Somers't, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carn'rv'nshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Dennis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (S. Pancras, E.
Lehmann, R. C.

Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (D'nc'st'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Rosc'm'n, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leeks.)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W. H. M. (S'ff'lk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'th'mpt'n)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, C'nt'l)
Price, Robert John (N'rf'lk, E.)
Priestley, W. E. B. Br'df'rd, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Sc'rboro')
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T. F. (W'lv'rh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Sir G. S. (Br'df'rd)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowden
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A. H. (Asht'n under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thompson, J. W. H. (S'm'set, E.
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Wason Rt. Hn. E. (Cl'ckm'nan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Wor'stersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (W'ch'ter)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewishan
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur

Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gretton, John
Hardy, Laurence (K'nt, Ashf'd)
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hervey, F. W. F. (B'y S. Edm'ds)
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsb'ry)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Keswick, William
King, Sir H'ny Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hn. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonor (Dulwich)
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt. Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nield, Herbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (D'rl'gton)
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, Jn. Frederick Pool
Roberts, S. (Sheffi'd, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverp'l, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormsk'rk)
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir William Bull and Mr. Charles Craig.

Resolution to be reported To-morrow.

METROPOLITAN WATER BOARD (CHARGES, &c.) BILL (BY ORDER).

Order for consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill, as amended, be now considered."

SIR F. BANBURY, in moving that the Bill be recommitted to a Private Bill Committee, said he did so for the following reasons. The Bill proposed a very large increase in the charges upon consumers of water in London. It was going to impose a charge of something like £100,000 a year additional on the City of London alone. Not only was it going to charge that large amount no the City, but it was going to impose a charge to an enormous amount on the manufacturers and traders of London as a whole. On the Second Reading he had opposed the Bill on a similar ground, but his Amendment was defeated, but he believed that a considerable number of hon. Members opposite would, if they had known what they knew now, have voted with him instead of against him. The Bill, being of a very contentious character, was unfortunately sent to a joint Committee, which was only one tribunal. If it had been sent to an ordinary Private Bill Committee, and if the evidence had not been brought forward in such a manner as to impress the Committee, or if there was new evidence, when the measure went before the Lords' Committee its opponents would have had an opportunity of advancing their arguments a second time. It had always been held that when a Private Bill went to a Private Bill Committee upstairs it should go through the two Committees, that of the Lords as well as that of the Commons. In this particular case the double Committee had been done away with, and the result had been most unsatisfactory. A large number of water consumers thought that the question had not received proper consideration, and therefore the best course to take would be to recommit the Bill in order that its opponents might be placed in the position they would have been in if the Bill had gone through the ordinary course. If after this had been done their arguments were considered to have no weight, then he would have nothing more to say. The object of the Bill was to raise charges for domestic supply from 3 per cent. to 5 per cent. There were only two areas which would benefit under the Bill. In the City of London the charges for water would be increased by £100,000 a year. He knew one case in which they were paying £700 a year for water, but under this Bill they would have to pay £1,500 a year. There was also to be some alteration in the method of assessing outside consumers. Some twenty years ago they had what was known as Dobb's decision, under which the rateable value was substituted for the annual value, and some of the outside areas were not brought in under that decision, because there was no obligation upon them to make a quinquennial assessment. For the sake of securing uniformity the Water Board had decided to reverse the decision in the Dodd case, and under this Bill they were charging the outside areas on their rateable value, with the result that the Board would lose about £50,000 a year, which would have to fall upon the purchasers of water within the Metropolitan area. That was a wrong principle to go upon, because it was far more expensive to supply water to an outside area on account of the pipes being longer. Therefore the Water Board were proposing to give to the water consumers in those outside areas who ought to pay more for their water a very great advantage as against the people of London proper. The Water Board raised the rates for water for manufacturing purposes some time ago, above the charges which had been previously made by the old companies, but he understood that the manufacturers had made themselves extremely unpleasant, and they were going to have their case met by the charges being brought down to those made by the water companies. The result of this would be that the small manufacturers would not benefit, and the vast majority of the people who consumed water for domestic purposes would have to pay for the benefits given to the manufacturers. In this as in other matters those who had made the most noise would receive the benefit, and the humbler and quieter people would be pushed on one side. It was in the interests of those people that he desired that the Bill should be recommitted, and that course would give an opportunity of reviewing an extremely important matter for the whole of the citizens of London. It was well known that the amount received in rates had increased since the companies' undertakings were acquired by the Water Board, and the amount required to pay interest on water stock was not so much as it used to be. On the face of it he did not see why there should be any loss at all. If there was a deficit under the Bill, the Water Board were empowered to levy a rate over the whole of London, and that would be the fairest way to deal with it, because in that way everybody in London would bear their just proportion. He begged to move.

Sir WILLIAM BULL (Hammersmith), in seconding the Motion, said he desired to hear on behalf of the promoters of the Bill what compromise they proposed to offer in order to meet the objections stated by the opponents. He frankly said that he did not know where they stood in regard to the small consumer and the large consumer, or in regard to the area outside of London.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words 'now considered,' and add the words 'recommitted to a Private Bill Committee'"—(*Sir Frederick Banbury*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words 'now considered' stand part of the Question."

*Mr. WATERLOW (Islington, N.) said he had given notice of an Amendment of his own, but as the question of the recommital of the Bill had been raised he would support the proposal of the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London. He did that, not necessarily because he wished to kill the Bill, but because the Motion gave an opportunity for raising the whole question. One reason why he and others wished to have the Bill recommitted was that they desired to readjust the burden on the water consumers throughout the whole area served by the Metropolitan Water Board, so that it might not gall in particular places where it might be greater than in others. He admitted that the Bill as a whole contained a great many provisions which would considerably improve the present system. Those who had been engaged in public work of one kind and another in London were of opinion that, with very slight alteration, the Bill might be very considerably improved in the way of equalising the burden as between the various areas. The joint Committee had practically admitted the inequality of the rates as between the outside and the inside areas. That inequality arose from the rating being in some places on annual value and in others on rateable value. The Committee considered that that was a matter for future legislation, and that they would not trouble about it in this Bill. The first point he wished to make was that if they were to trust to future legislation for the redress of this inequality they might possibly have to wait for a very considerable time. Perhaps the President of the Local Government Board would give some assurance as to that, but though the right hon. Gentleman might have the best will in the world to take up at once the question of revaluation, he might find it extremely difficult to get the time in view of the great mass of work which this House had to do. On these grounds he and his friends would rather maintain the *status quo.* He asked the House to recollect that it was the *status quo* they desired to maintain. Everybody recognised the great labours which the Committee had given in connection with the Bill. The area over which the Bill extended embraced a population probably exceeding 6,000,000, and that fact consequently raised the measure to one of first class importance. As between the different parts of the entire area there should be fair and equal treatment. The difficulty in regard to annual value and rateable value created a new inequality which did not exist at the present time. After long controversy the old water companies were bought up by the present Metropolitan Water Board. Each of the eight companies which formerly supplied London with water had its own basis of charging, and Parliament in transferring the concerns to the new board imposed on them an obligation by Clause 15 of the Act of 1902 to bring in a Bill to equalise the charges. The measure now before the House was that Equalisation Bill. He did not complain of the Bill having been introduced; but he wished to point out that it created a fresh inequality which did not exist before as between the area under the London County Council and the area which lay outside the jurisdiction of that council. It arose simply from the difference in the law of rating in the two areas. Within the London County Council area, under the Water Rating Definition Act of 1885, water was assessed on the rateable value. In the extra London area, under the Water Clauses Act of 1847, the annual value was the basis for the charge. The present Bill proposed to abolish the annual value as the basis of assessment. On the face of it that might seem a fair proceeding, but it was not, because in the London County Council area there was a quinquennial valuation, while in the outside area there was no such valuation. Therefore in the outside area there was no revaluation, and, as a result, there was not a common denominator. The inside area had a periodical revaluation, but in the outside area there was no periodical revaluation. If they adopted the rateable value in the outside area, it might go for years without revision, and the effect would be that whilst those in the inside area would be always screwed up to the highest pitch, those in the outside area would not be screwed up at all. There would thus be an increasing burden on the London inside area. He was to some extent speaking for the majority of the London Members, but he had also in support of his view a communication from the Islington Borough Council, and a large number of representations from the London County Council, who desired that the present arrangements should stand and that the Bill should be amended in respect to this matter. The Islington Borough Council said—

> "I am directed by my Council to ask the Members representing Islington to use their utmost endeavours to get the Bill amended so as to more fully protect the interests of the water consumers in the county of London and particularly in the borough of Islington."

The London County Council had gone into the matter very closely and had opposed the Bill in Committee, and now asked that the Bill should be amended. It was not only the old London County Council who had acted in this way. The present and new London County Council had also adopted the same attitude. On 24th January, 1907, the County Council passed a resolution that petitions should be sealed and presented against the Bill, and in a report they said that the measure proposed that the basis of the charge for domestic supply was in the future to be the rateable value of any house as it appeared in the Valuation List. That was at present the basis in the county of London, but in the extra London district it was the annual value. The annual value, the report said, was a higher rate than the rateable value, owing to there being no periodical revaluation in those districts as there was in London; and having regard to the inequality that must arise in consequence of the proposed alteration in the basis of charge, they considered they should lodge a petition against that Bill. On 14th February a further report was presented in which they said that they found upon examination that the Bill in no way provided for a uniform scale of charges, but merely for a fixed maximum charge, leaving it open to the board to make any charges within these maximum charges. They also said that the charge for royal parks was to be a fixed charge of 6d. per 1,000 gallons, and they thought the supply to all public parks and gardens and open spaces should be treated alike. The new council said they could not but regard the proposal to substituterateable value for annual value as the basis of the water rate in the extra-London districts as most unsatisfactory from the point of view of London. They further said that the existing powers of the Water Board with regard to fixing the charge outside London were fully sufficient to enable it to settle a basis which would be uniform with a basis prescribed by law inside the county, and the Amendment put forward by the council was only intended to continue those powers to the board. That raised a very important point. If they maintained the existing system the Water Board could regulate the basis of charge and could, if they so thought fit, adopt, almost without any trouble whatever, the rateable value as their general basis of charge. The effect of the proposal in the Bill was given in the Water Board's evidence and in a memorandum issued by the Central London Chamber of Commerce. It would be to increase the charge on London by £10,618 a year. The excess of annual values over rateable values, according to the report of the London County Council of 20th June, 1907, amounted to a total assessment of £536,292. With the adoption of rateable value as the basis, the board would lose the right to charge on this amount of assessment, which would be equivalent to a loss in water rates, with a 5 per cent. rate, of £26,805 per annum. It was clear, however, that if the assessment of all houses—many of which, as already stated, were charged on less than the rateable value—were fully rectified, this figure of £26,815 would be very greatly increased. That was practically the case they wished to make, and he thought, inasmuch as they had apparently got nearly a month before Parliament was likely to rise, there was ample time for the matter to be reconsidered by the Committee. As he had said, he did not wish to kill the Bill, but only to give ample time for the consideration of it, and therefore he supported the Motion.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea) said that if the Motion to recommit this Bill was carried it would be a very serious matter. The House would in that case have decided against the proposals of the London Water Board, and if the Motion was carried it would kill the Bill. If that happened it would cost next year much for legal expenses in the shape of money that personally he should like to see used by the Water Board in reducing the rates to consumers, large and small. If the Bill were recommitted for the sake of uniformity that could never be secured, for a number of people would still have some complaint against the Water Board, even if this Motion was carried, and the same arguments would be used by those who were left out of the preferential scale, and by those whose prices might have been increased in order to secure uniformity. Might he ask the House to look at this matter from the point of view of the Water Board, and also of the consumer. Parliament appointed the Water Board to look after the water supply of 514 square miles inside and outside of London, and £40,000,000 of property, from which an income of £2,750,000 was derived every year. That Water Board had been in power but a short time and had been unable to make anything but a small profit or a small deficit, and he thought it was unreasonable of Parliament to expect anything else in so short a time. And Parliament did another thing besides devolving this enormous responsibility upon this body. It said that after a certain number of years the Water Board, whether it liked it or not, should come to Parliament with a Bill establishing uniformity of charge throughout the limits of supply, and therefore the Water Board produced this Bill, which had gone before a

Joint Committee of both Houses and been examined by them. The Water Board had no choice in regard to the Bill, which, like the parent Bill, went to a Joint Committee, as Parliament in its wisdom had ordered. He thought it was wise that the same tribunal which passed the original Bill should deal with the question of uniformity of prices. The Bill had therefore gone upstairs to a Joint Committee and had been examined by them for thirteen days. The Committee were unanimous after that examination, he believed, in passing the Bill which was now before the House. But it had not been said, and he rose to say it, that since the Bill left the Committee substantial concessions had been made to those interests who thought they had not been so favourably dealt with as they were entitled to be. These interests were the trading and manufacturing interests of London. These gentlemen said, and it was to their appeal he listened, that if the Water Board persisted in maintaining the charges as they passed through Committee, some of the large manufacturers in certain parts of London, by reason of the additional charge placed upon them, would probably have to consider the very serious step of moving their works outside the area of supply. When he was confronted with that he did what every Minister of the Crown had a right to do: he took the opportunity of seeing whether the differences between the opponents of the Water Board and that body could not be adjusted. Given in round figures, it appeared that if a reduction of £21,000 per annum was made these interests would withdraw their opposition and would not move their Amendments, as he was glad to see they had not done. The Water Board went further, and gave to those interests £24,000. Beyond that they had given a concession to market gardeners, which he thought ought to have been given. It might be said that it was the large manufacturers who alone received this concession, but he was afraid it was the law of life not only in regard to Water Bills but in regard to other Bills that the big fish eat the little fish and the little fish eat mud; but that was not the case here, because one had to consider that if the burden fell upon the larger manufacturers there would be more disturbance in consequence of the shifting of trade than in the case of smaller industries. It might also be said that the other interests which approached the Water Board had not been similarly dealt with, but his answer to that was that the charges in the Bill were maximum charges and if with the improvement of trade more prosperous conditions came to the Water Board in the future there was no reason why the Water Board should not give consideration to the smaller traders, and he would be glad to bring to bear such influence as he had upon the Board in that direction. Nobody had taken any exception to the general scheme of the Bill, and considering the enormous size of the area administered and the value of the property dealt with and the difficulties of the procedure, he wondered on the whole that the board had done so well as they had. The Bill amalgamated services which were formerly disunited, and it equalised the values at which prices could be properly ascertained. It made the service inside and outside the area uniform, and it made the values inside and outside the area the same. What was more, in 87 per cent. of the houses in and outside the London area it had reduced the charge by the sum of £82,000, while it had increased the charge on 13 per cent. of the houses rated at £200 a year and over by £108,000. It had reduced the cost of water to manufacturers and traders and introduced meter rents. It had introduced a rateable value outside the county which he believed to be the only fair and equitable basis of assessment. He believed that the Water Board would meet any reasonable demands upon them, and he appealed to the House not to put the Water Board, and through them the inhabitants of London, to the expense of another Water Bill, when, after all, rough justice had been done with a fair intention and in an even-handed manner to all the interests affected by this great service. He had done his best to be a medium and an arbitrator between the conflicting interests, and he asked the House to pass the Bill on condition that the two Amendments which he had mentioned were accepted by the Water Board. He was sure that that body would receive any suggestion from the Local Government Board for further equalisation in a proper spirit, and he could only say that while he was responsible as the Minister whose duty it was, he would continue to look into this matter. He urged the House to accept the Bill and not to put the Water Board to the trouble of bringing another Bill into the House in two or three years which would be met by the same arguments which had been used against this Bill. He asked the House to believe that the tribunal which had dealt with the matter had dealt with it in the interests of all concerned.

MR. WALTER LONG said he only intervened because it was his duty to pass through the House of Commons the preliminary measure which was the origin of the Bill before the House. It was unnecessary for him to go into the history of the measure, because the President of the Local Government Board had done that, but he desired to support the right hon. Gentleman in the course he had taken. Going back, as he was able to do, to the preliminary stage preceding the passing of the Act which set up the Water Board, he remembered, as everybody else who took an active part in the discussion must remember, that the question of the water charges in the Metropolis formed one of the most prominent points of controversy which then raged. When Parliament threw this duty on the Water Board it knew perfectly well that it was throwing upon them a duty of a most difficult kind, and that it would be a matter of extraordinary difficulty to find a common basis which would be generally accepted. The difficulty in London not only connected with the water question, but in connection with other questions, had been due to the fact that London was different in its position from any other big city or town in the United Kingdom. Whereas Glasgow, Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester, or any big city they liked to name, could be dealt with as single areas, London, until the passing of this Act, was divided into eight separate districts for the purpose of water supply. The bases of charge were different, and, what was more important, not only were the statutory bases of charge different, but the obligations thrown on the different companies arising out of the constitution and character of the separate areas varied in a most remarkable way, and, therefore, each water company really supplied a district which was quite different in the character and requirements of the people living in it from the other areas. All these duties were now concentrated upon the Metropolitan Water Board, and, although he could quite understand the dissatisfaction which had been voiced by his hon. friend the Member for the City of London and others, he did not believe that it was possible to find any solution of the question which would not produce considerable irritation and dissatisfaction on the part of some people. They had got, in fact, to make some people pay more than others in order to get equalisation of charges and do justice all round. They knew perfectly well that those who were released from some portion of the burden, or that those on whom no additional burden was imposed, would not show gratitude, whereas those who had to pay in excess of what they had been previously charged would naturally complain and ask that the matter should be reconsidered. He was confident that reconsideration would not improve the proposals of the Bill. They might tear the whole thing up, yet it would only entail much heavier and increased charges on London, and he respectfully asked the House to agree to accept the Bill. He desired to congratulate the President of the Local Government Board on the part he had taken in the matter, because the right hon. Gentleman had no responsibility for the passing of the Act which led to the introduction of this Bill. The President of the Local Government Board was at one time inclined to oppose the measure, but he had now acted as *amicus curæ* in the matter with absolute fairness to all the people concerned; he had done his best not for one party or the other in the dispute, but to aid in the solution of this great London difficulty. He believed the advice which the right hon. Gentleman had given was well founded; and he thought that it would be in the interests of London that the next stage of this difficult question should be settled now, and, if any further steps were called for, he was convinced that to whomsoever it might fall to deal with the question it would be dealt with in the interests of London.

*MR. STRAUS (Tower Hamlets, Mile End) said he should not vote for the recommittal of the Bill, because there were very valuable things in it which it would be a great pity for London to lose. But there were also some very great dangers in the Bill which certainly ought to be taken out, and he earnestly hoped that some of the Amendments on the Paper would be accepted, and that thereby the measure would be strengthened and made of some real value to London. If these Amendments were not carried, however, he would sooner that the Bill was killed to-night, because he believed that it would simply go on making the anomaly more absurd in the future than it had been in the past. It could not be right for London Members, at any rate Members representing the inside London area, to vote for anything which made the inside area suffer and the outside area benefit. The Bill as it stood now was not quite the immaculate and remarkably well considered measure that might be imagined outside from what had been said, because the estimates were based on the valuations made before the last quinquennial valuation, and consequently the valuations and the figures which they had were not correct or up to date; and if they considered the last quinquennial valuation they would find, he was quite confident, that a great deal of the loss which had been estimated would not occur. In undertaking not to vote for the recommittal of this Bill, London Members, either Liberal or Tory, in no way pledged themselves to vote for it, unless some of the Amendments which were on the Paper, and which they considered of the utmost importance, were accepted in order to ensure that the rates would be levied on a proper and fair basis.

*MR. BARNARD (Kidderminster) said he would like on behalf of the Water Board to thank both the President of the Local Government Board and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin for the manner in which they had approached this question. The Water Board were pledged to bring in this Bill; they had no interests of any sort to serve, there was no intention of favouritism, and they had tried as far as they were able to hold the balance between all the different interests which were involved. The President of the Local Government Board had mentioned that he had had an interview with the representatives of the Water Board after the Bill had left the Committee, and that he had pointed out to them that in his opinion some amendment in connection with the trade scale was desirable; and after they had seen the right hon. Gentleman, they had a second and a third interview with him, in which they made it emphatically clear that as far as advising the Water Board was concerned they could only go to the extent of not opposing the amendment of the scale; they could not volunteer to accept it, because they did not think it a desirable alteration which the right hon. Gentleman, in his wisdom, suggested was suitable. Their reason for not volunteering to accept it was a financial one. The Water Board had to collect nearly £3,000,000 a year with which to do its work, and the responsibility for doing that, without risking a rate-in-aid, was very heavy and onerous. The Board were of opinion that it was most undesirable in any way whatever to risk a rate-in-aid, and the whole framework of their scheme was based on that conclusion. The President of the Local Government Board had also pointed out that the market gardeners should get some warning before being cut off. The Board said they were willing to extend the time to seven days in order that the market gardeners might have the opportunity of making other arrangements. He expressed his sincere thanks to the President of the Local Government Board for the manner in which he had brought the parties together. The hon. Member for Islington had suggested that the new rating basis proposed by the Bill would involve a hardship. He ventured to think that that was very largely imaginary, since the resulting loss of income was represented by an annual sum of £10,600, and when this was subdivided it was found that, roughly speaking, £8,000 represented an actual overcharge within the West Ham Union. Since the discussions in the Committee the Board had gone closely into the figures, and they found that they could not maintain the present valuation. The water assessments for the West Ham Union were above what they ought to be, and it appeared to him that the time had come for revising them. But on the other questions they could not go any further in the way of concession than the President of the Local Government Board had pointed out.

*MR. BURDETT-COUTTS (Westminster) said that when he saw two right hon. Gentlemen on opposite Front Benches patting each other on the back and the hon. Gentleman responsible for the Bill patting both those right hon. Gentlemen on the back, he observed a position eminently threatening to the general interests of Members and particularly so to the interests of the consumers of water. If he had no other reason for opposing the Bill, he should find one in the fact that a measure, affecting the health and welfare of 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 inhabitants of London, had been brought forward at that hour of the night. He had listened, not with much surprise, to his right hon. friend, who had evinced a paternal solicitude in the doings of the Water Board which he created, but he confessed he had a little more surprise when he heard the right hon. Gentleman opposite say they must look at the matter from the point of view of the Water Board. He looked at it from the point of view of the consumer who lived in London, who was highly rented and highly rated, and whose assessments were constantly raised by quinquennial revision, and who by the Bill was being mulcted in favour of the man who lived outside London and who paid a low rent, and a low rate, and had no revision. Moreover, the latter's rent was largely represented by the cost of his railway fares to and from London, on which he was not rated for water. His right hon. friend and the right hon. Gentleman opposite and the hon. Member below the gangway had supported the Bill on the ground of its uniformity of charge, but there was absolutely no uniformity in the charge established by the Bill. The average cost of water per head was 5s. 7d.; the charge for that water outside was 4s. 1d. and 6s. 3d. inside. By this Bill the outside charge was reduced to 3s. 7d. and the inside raised to 6s. 9d. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether that was a uniform charge. [AN HON. MEMBER: "How many gallons do they use inside and outside?"] He should like to refer to another distinction which many people might not have in their minds In London a man paid £100 for a house which the man who lived outside got for £60. Both used the same amount of water, but the man in London had to pay £5 for his water, while the man in the country only had to pay £3. Was that uniformity? Another point which struck him as extraordinary was that while the big business man and the well-to-do tradesman had been favoured the poorer man was penalised, and the man who was rated above £300 a year for an office or shop he locked up at night got a rebate of 20 per cent. on his water rate while the man who occupied a smaller shop which was not above £300 got no rebate. He asked what justice there was in the struggling professional man or shopkeeper who paid £50, or £100, or £200 rent not getting a rebate while his neighbour who paid£300 or £400 received that benefit. At that late hour he could not go into other matters; but for these two reasons, because the Bill set up absolutely no uniformity of charge and because it was hard on the small man, he would vote for its re-committal.

*MR. LUKE WHITE (Yorkshire, E.R., Buckrose) did not wish to stand between the House and a division, except for a few moments. As one of the Members of the Committee he said the Bill did secure uniformity of charge throughout the whole area. The House had laid it down that the Board should bring in a Bill similar to this this session. He thought it should be pointed out that the Committee which originally considered the question laid down two great principles. The first was that there should be uniformity as to the basis on which the charge was to be made, and the second was that there should be uniformity as to the amount of the charge, namely, 5 per cent. on the rateable value as a maximum charge. He asked the House to support the Committee and to pass the Bill in the form in which it was now before them. A great deal had been said about the injustice which would be done to London, both inside and outside the Metropolitan area, if the Bill became law. He wished to point out that there were at the present time about 1,000,000 buildings in the area which received a water supply, and, if the Bill was passed, the effect would be that less than one-fourth would have to pay an increased rate. A little over one-fourth would be undisturbed, and nearly one-half—that was to say 500,000 of houses—would benefit by having a lower rate. On every ground that could be urged, it would be a great misfortune if the Bill were not passed during the present session, and he hoped that the House would defeat the Motion at present before it.

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 163 ; Noes, 53. (Division List No. 306.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Balcarres, Lord
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bertram, Julius
Branch, James
Brodie, H. C.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Causton, Rt Hn. Richard Knight
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Clancy, John Joseph
Clough, William
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Craig, Herbert J. (Teignm'th)
Craik, Sir Henry
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Devlin, Joseph
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duffy, William, J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Forster, Henry William
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazelton, Richard
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharp
Hills, J. W.
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hogan, Michael
Holt, Richard Durning
Hudson, Walter
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt Hn. Col. W.
Kilbride, Denis
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lever, A. Levy (Ess'x, Harw'h)
Lewis, John Herbert
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Chas. (Donegal, E)
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Mooney, J. J.
Murnaghan, George
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'y, Mid.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Shea, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darl'gton)
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Cent'l)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E)
Radford, G. H.
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'pton)
Richardson, A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'd)
Robinson, S.
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton un'r Lyne)
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smith, Abel H. (Hereford, E.)
Spicer, Sir Albert
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Sutherland, J. E.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somers't)
Thorne, William
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Valentia, Viscount
Verney, F. W.
Walsh, Stephen
Watt, Henry A.

Whitbread, Howard
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, N'rth)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R)
Whitley, John Henry (H'lif'x)
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, J. W. (W'cestersh N.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhought'n)
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir John Bethell and Mr. Barnard.

NOES.

Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bowerman, C. W.
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewish'm
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Courthope, G. Loyd
Dalrymple, Viscount
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Panc's, N.
Gretton, John
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hedges, A. Paget
Hervey, F. W. F. Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsb'ry)
Horniman, Emslie John
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull
Lane Fox, G. R.
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morpeth, Viscount
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Percy, Earl
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott, Sir S (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Soares, Ernest J.
Starkey, John R.
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Wiles, Thomas
Wilson, P. W. (S. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Sir Frederick Banbury and Mr. Waterlow.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill, as amended, considered.

MR. FLETCHER (Hampstead) moved the following new clause: "Notwithstanding anything in this Act contained, the water rates shall continue to be payable according to the annual value of the house or building, or part of a house or building, supplied with water by the board, and such annual value shall (except within the unions and parishes to which the Valuation (Metropolis) Act, 1869, extends) be determined in accordance with the provisions of Section 68 of the Waterworks Clauses Act, 1847, and shall in no case be less than the rateable value according to the poor rate valuations." He said that under the Bill it was desired to bring about a uniformity in the water charge, but the Bill did not secure uniformity in the mode of assessment. The reason of this was that while the administrative county of London was revalued every five years and its rateable value was thus kept up to date, there was no statutory revaluation outside the administrative area. The result was that the water consumer outside London was not paying a fair charge, and the unfortunate ratepayers of London had to pay the difference. The Water Board, they were informed, had a very small margin between its expenditure and the sum which was brought in by its charges. Therefore, if any part of the water area did not pay its due proportion, obviously the balance had to be paid by the unfortunate in-dwellers in the county of London, and an injustice was thus perpetuated. If the President of the Local Government Board could assure them that some effort would be made to extend the Bill of 1865 to the whole water area, then, of course, the grievance to which he had alluded would disappear, but if that was not done he should feel bound to press his Amendment.

*MR. W. F. D. SMITH, in seconding, said that he had heard nothing, not even from the two right hon. Gentlemen on the respective Front Benches, to convince him that the basis of charges was conceived equally as between the two areas. The President of the Local Government Board had said that the Bill equalised the value. The value was equal in name, and in name only, because, as a matter of fact, neither the law nor the practice of carrying out the law within and without London was the same. The result was that even at the present time there were almost absurd anomalies in in the rateable valuation outside London. He believed the right hon. Gentleman was going to introduce a Valuation Bill next session. If that were so this was putting the cart before the horse. It would be far more satisfactory if they had the Valuation Bill, and saw what it was to be. Then they might have a principle fair alike to everybody. There was another point to which he would like to refer. It might be said that there was no good putting this extra charge upon outside London, because, after all, London within the border would still have to pay 5 per cent. on its rateable value. He thought there was a reason for putting this extra charge upon outer London, and it was this. As the Member for Westminster had said, a house assessed for £300 a year and not assessed for inhabited house duty would under this Bill get a reduction of 20 per cent. The Water Board were empowered to raise that reduction to 30 per cent., and if they got an extra revenue from the outside areas it might be possible for them, within a short period, to give 30 per cent. instead of 20 per cent. There might be this further advantage, that the poorer ratepayers to whom his hon. friend referred would also receive some advantage under the Bill, and they required it even more than the others.

New clause—

"Notwithstanding anything in this Act contained the water rates shall continue to be payable according to the annual value of the house or building, or part of a house or building, supplied with water by the Board, and such annual value shall (except within the unions and parishes to which The Valuation (Metropolis) Act, 1869, extends) be determined in accordance with the provisions of section sixty-eight of The Waterworks Clauses Act, 1847, and shall in no case be less than the rateable value according to the poor rate valuations."—(*Mr. Fletcher.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

*MR. WHITBREAD (Huntingdonshire, Huntingdon) said that as one of the Members of the Joint Committee which reconsidered the Bill, he hoped the Amendment would not be pressed to a division, or that, if it were, the House would reject it. The grievance that had been put forward, and that the Amendment sought to redress, undoubtedly existed to a certain extent. Where they had various areas which up to now had been assessed by different bodies, and probably on rather various principles, and then passed an Act, or brought forward a Bill which threw them all together for rateable purposes, it was inevitable there must be a certain inequality in the burden imposed on the ratepayers in the district as a whole. That was one of the inevitable results of placing together for rating purposes districts which had hitherto been rated separately and differently. But that was a grievance which might be properly dealt with when the Valuation Bill was brought in at a future session, and not one that could be safely remedied by that Bill, for these reasons. It was sought to rectify the difficulty which arose from the fact that inner London was by virtue of its quinquennial assessment valued up to the hilt, whereas the outer districts were probably not valued in the same way, and the ratepayers in the outer districts, under the Bill as it stood, would escape a certain amount of their fair burden. There were two objections to remedying this by the Amendment. The first was that if they carried that Amendment they would run a very serious risk of inflicting injustice in one portion the area while they remedied it in another. The total annual revenue which was in question in the case had been placed at various figures. As a matter of fact, he did not believe it was as high as one of the totals which had been mentioned, but whether it was high or not, it was a fact that the greater portion of that income, roughly three-quarters of it, was drawn from a part of Essex in the Poor Law union of West Ham, where it was admitted as a fact that the rateable value was as high as the rateable value in inner London. If they were by the Amendment to impose annual value on the whole of the outside districts they would, as a matter of fact, inflict an unjust and harsh burden on three-quarters of the persons whose burdens they sought to equalise. The other objection to the Amendment was that the whole genesis and principle of the Bill was that they were to impose uniform rates of charges upon the whole area administered by the Water Board. It might be expedient, and it might be just, to levy a rate upon rateable value in one part of the area, and on annual value in another. It might turn out to inflict no hardship, but there was one thing that was quite certain, and that was that it was not a uniform rate of charge. For these reasons he hoped the House would reject the Amendment.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) said he rose to appeal to the House whether it was possible to discuss that night a measure of enormous importance involving to some extent the health and welfare of the people of London. Owing to the procedure which the Government had thought it right to adopt in reference to an entirely different measure not affecting England at all, they were asked to discuss this Bill after eleven o'clock. It had now reached almost one in the morning, and they were just beginning the eight pages of Amendments which stood on the Paper in reference to the Bill. He suggested to the House that the time had now arrived when further consideration of the measure might be adjourned. He did not believe that that would have any unfortunate effect either on the measure or in regard to those who desired its amendment. He thought a little consideration outside that chamber might well result in some kind of arrangement; at any rate he was quite confident that at that hour it was impossible to ask the House to consider fairly and with the proper patience and impartiality the details of that very important and complicated measure affecting London. He did not desire to use that opportunity to prolong the debate, and therefore he concluded by moving that the debate be adjourned.

MR. F. E. SMITH (Liverpool, Walton) seconded. He thought there was some advantage in those who were not London Members addressing that appeal to the House, on a subject which might seem at first sight to be exclusively one that concerned Members for London, but it must be obvious that on a measure of this kind, in which there were so many sections desiring to lay their views before the House, that could not be usefully done at such a late period of the evening. Even the Government would admit that there were questions in it on which different opinions might be held, and it would be extremely undesirable that at one o'clock the House should set itself seriously to consider the many pages of Amendments. He hoped the House would take that view. There was no desire in that part of the House that there should be obstruction or unnecessary delay so far as the Bill was concerned, but a widespread desire that so important a measure should receive adequate consideration.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this debate be now adjourned."—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

*MR. JOHN BURNS: The noble Lord and the hon. Member who has just sat down will not, I hope, press their appeal for the adjournment of this particular measure. The substance of the Bill has been decided on the Motion to recommit, and the House is fully informed as to the only remaining point of difference between the two sides in the controversy. If we were to adjourn the debate from to-night to some subsequent date, I think there is not the least doubt that with other measures pressing for equal consideration we should find ourselves considering this Bill at an even later hour on some subsequent morning. As the House has the full facts before it I trust we may settle the matter and come to a decision upon the Amendment as soon as possible. I cannot accept the view of the noble Lord, and I would point out to him, if he is anxious to get forward matters vitally affecting the interests of London, that the matter is substantially agreed upon, and I trust we may be able to get the Bill through to-night.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 60; Noes, 125. (Division List No. 307.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir A. F.
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bowerman, C. W.
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.

Carlile, E. Hildred
Cavendish,Rt.Hn.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Coates,E.Feetham(Lewisham)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H(Sussex,EGr'nst'd
Courthope, G. Loyd
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancr'sN.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gretton, John
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey,F.W.F.(B'ryS.Edm's)
Hill, Sir Clement(Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Horniman, Emslie John
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lea,Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras,E
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morpeth, Viscount
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Pease,Herb'rt.Pike(Darlingt'n
Percy, Earl
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Radford, G. H.
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W.W. (Liverpool)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone,W.)
Seaverns, J. H.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Waterlow, D. S.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilson, P. W. (St.Pancras, S.)
Wilson,W. T. (Westhoughton
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Lord Robert Cecil and Mr. F. E. Smith.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Baring,Godfrey(Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Ess'x,Romf'rd
Branch, James
Brodie, H. C.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Causton,Rt.Hn.Rich'rdKnight
Cave, George
Clancy, John Joseph
Clough, William
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Craig, Herbert J.(Tynemouth)
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Cullinan, J.
Davis, Ellis William (Eifion)
Devlin, Joseph
Duffy, William J.
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hogan, Michael
Holt, Richard Durning
Hudson, Walter
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carn'rv'nshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Lever.A.Levy (Essex,H'rwich
Lewis, John Herbert
Long,Rt.Hn.W'lt'r (D'blin S.)
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah(DownS.)
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal E)
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Mond, A.
Mooney, J. J.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Kendal(Tipper'yMid)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh,Central)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E)
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rea,Walter Russell(Scarboro')
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'ton)
Richardson, A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'd)
Robinson, S.
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Thompson,J.W.H.(S'm'rset,E
Thorne, William
Walsh, Stephen
Watt, Henry A.
Whitbread, Howard
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley,John Henry(Halifax
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, J. W. (Wor'stersh, N.)
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Original Question again proposed.

*MR. DICKINSON said he was sorry to have to speak on the subject at such a late hour, but he was sure hon. Members would understand that it was not the fault of the London Members that the House was detained there, because they had expected that the Bill would come on for discussion in the ordinary way at a quarter past eight. Circumstances over which they had no control had brought them into the present position, and the only thing to do was for Members to speak as briefly as they could. The hon. Member who spoke on behalf of the Committee had just said that one of the chief reasons why he resisted the Amendment and supported the Bill was that the Committee had gone on the basis of attaining a uniformity of charge all over the area. It was precisely because it was not and could not be a uniform charge so long as the basis of assessment was not uniform that the Members for London were anxious that, at any rate for the present, the existing system should hold good. The House would understand that the present system was discussed in the House of Commons in the year 1885, and a Bill was then brought in for the purpose of forcing the Water Company to raise their rate upon the rateable value. That Bill was proposed to extend to the whole area of the Water Company, but, the then President of the Local Government Board, the Member for the Forest of Dean, consented to the insertion of Amendments limiting the operations of the Bill to the Metropolis. The arguments used then were precisely the same as the arguments which were used now. The circumstances had not changed in any way since that time. In fact, if anything, the position was worse than it was then, because, owing to the system of quinquennial valuations, the valuation in London had gone up by leaps and bounds, while outside the administrative county the valuation had not gone up. He had had certain figures got out by the officials of the London County Council which showed the difference in the valuation. He was informed of a house rated at £24 in Hornsey which would, at the same rental, be rated at £34 if it were in London. In the case of a house in another district the rent was £90 and the rateable value was £46; but if that house were in London the rateable value would be £75. That state of things held good in a large number of places. There were several reasons for it, one of them being that outside London a different system of arriving at the rateable value of premises was adopted. In London they made a deduction of one-sixth in order to arrive at the rateable value, whereas outside London the deduction in many cases was one-fifth. Then, again, there was no system of quinquennial valuation outside London, and in the absence of this the valuation was stereotyped from year to year. Mention had been made of the case of West Ham. It was quite true that in that district the East London Company screwed up the assessment to such an extent that they got it above the rateable value, and to that extent West Ham was harshly dealt with. But in the evidence given before the Committee upstairs, however, he found that the comptroller of the Water Board made the following important statement. He said—

> "In the East London area the Board will be bound, whether annual values are adopted in this Bill or otherwise, to make the allowance foreshadowed in the table of something like £8,000 a year."

Clearly, wherever the rateable value was properly assessed, as in West Ham, it would be the duty of the board to revise its annual value until it was the same as the rateable value. Therefore places like West Ham would not pay more than they would on the basis of rateable value, since they could now secure equitable treatment of the question by the Water Board. The difficulty was that other places outside London were really under-assessed, and would under this Bill continue to be so. He thought that they should be compelled to pay on a basis which was fair in comparison with the payments in London, and the only way in which that could be secured was to continue the system of annual values. The annual value would be the rateable value where it was fair, and something more than the rateable value where the latter was unfair. He had looked through the evidence carefully, and he ventured to think that the figures as laid before the Committee, though perfectly accurate as far as they went, were not thoroughly investigated in all their aspects. He would ask the House to consider one or two of the figures for a moment. Even if the charges were to be levied on the present system of annual values, so beneficial was the Bill to the poorer outside districts that they would pay £39,000 less than they had paid hitherto. That was the amount they gained by a system of equalisation. But when they came to have the additional advantage which was to be bestowed upon them by the proposal that rateable value should be taken instead of annual value, it added nearly £27,000 to the advantage gained by the outside districts, making a total advantage of £66,000 a year, while all the time inner London was going to pay more. He had got out similar fiures to those given by the hon. Member for Westminster, and he found that the amount charged for domestic purposes only worked out at 6s. 2¾d. per head in London, whereas under the Bill it would work out at 6s. 3¾d. In outer London the amount worked out at present at 4s. 8½d., but under the Bill it would work out at 4s. 1½d. which, as the House would see, meant a considerable reduction. He thought those figures justified the attitude taken up by the Members for London constituencies on both sides of the House. Both Conservative Members and Liberal Members earnestly asked the House to pass the Amendment. They attached great importance to the Amendment, which could not possibly wreck the Bill, because the effect of it was to make the system more uniform throughout the whole area, as they would be basing the system as far as they could on a uniform assessment and also using the same charge of 5 per cent. If the President of the Local Government Board could only see his way to consent to some Amendment which would continue that system until he brought in his proposed Valuation Bill, he thought it would satisfy the London Members. Until that came to pass he ventured to think it was a reasonable request which the London Members made that the existing system should go on for the present. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman might see his way to assent to the proposal made by the hon. Member for Hampstead, that outside London the basis should be the annual value.

*Mr. BARNARD said that one or two figures which had been quoted required explanation. The matter was of some importance because there had been an attempt to make out that the difference between annual and rateable value would inflict very serious injury on inner London. He wanted the House to understand that "uniformity" dealt with particular classes of property and had nothing whatever to do with locality. The mere chance circumstance of where the property might be situated was, after all, accidental. He would like to make the real position clear. The last speaker had said that he did not know very much about West Ham. He (Mr. Barnard) held in his hand a table which he quoted to the House. It showed that the whole amount at issue was represented by something like £10,600. Of this amount £7,800 was inside the West Ham Union. The last speaker admitted the contention he (Mr. Barnard) tried to place before the House when he said, speaking on the Motion for recommittal, that the West Ham charges were probably wrong. If that was the case, what was the issue before the House? A question of £2,800 a year. Was it not too trivial that they should be asked to go contrary to the principle of uniformity because it was suggested that London might lose £2,800 a year out of an income of nearly £3,000,000. One word more. There were precedents for the Board's action. Reference had been made to a matter in which Tottenham many years ago made a bargain with the Board of Works. Payment was to be on rateable value. The bargain was capable of revision. The London County Council, which stepped into the shoes of the Board of Works, might have claimed revision if they objected to rateable value being taken as the basis in the case of Tottenham, but they did nothing of the sort. He would quote a further case. The County Council had themselves made a bargain with Willesden, and in connection with it the basis was rateable value. There was another case that might be taken—the Metropolitan Police. Outside the areas where the Water Board were collecting on annual value at present they had Metropolitan police, and the Home Office collected on rateable values. Why should not the same doctrine be adopted by the Water Board? Lastly, there was an arbitration recently between the London County Council and West Ham upon a very big question involving a large money payment. The arbitrator Sir Hugh Owen—a very distinguished gentleman in the Local Government world, in his decision gave the verdict that the contribution from West Ham was to be on rateable value. He (Mr. Barnard) therefore put it to the House that as rateable value was accepted in the instances he had mentioned it was equally applicable to the matter they were discussing at that moment.

MR. WATERLOW said he had already spoken, but he wanted the House to understand one point. Supposing the Amendment were accepted, there was nothing to prevent rateable value being adopted by the Water Board for West Ham or any other district. Moreover, the Board could always reduce its water rate, and if they were convinced that annual value made it too high they could bring it down to rateable value. On the other hand, they who knew that rateable value in London in many districts was too low would be satisfied if the Board could revise the system.

SIR F. BANBURY said that the Bill did not ensure uniformity. If the rateable value outside London was calculated in the same manner as it was calculated in London there would be nothing to say. It was because the Bill was not uniform that the London Members on both sides were determined to offer their most strenuous opposition. He regretted very much having to speak at 1.25 a.m., but it was not his fault but the fault of the Government, who were now endeavouring to force through a most important question in a House of 180 Members. It was an unheard-of thing in the history of the House of Commons to take a Private Bill dealing with such a question at such an hour. He would point out that the figures which had been given by the hon. Member for Kidderminster were misleading. It was difficult to be absolutely accurate in figures, but he made out that the amount in the case of the outside areas was £49,000 and not £56,000. It was certainly not a matter of £2,000. The hon. Gentleman was endeavouring to mislead the House. [Cries of "Order" and "Withdraw."]

*MR. BARNARD: I rise to a point of order. I was quoting from a table handed in to the Joint Committee, which is now open to the inspection of the Members of the House.

MR. O'SHEE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is an hon. Gentleman entitled to charge another hon. Gentleman with endeavouring to mislead the House?

*MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member suggested it was done for any sinister purpose it would not be in order; but I do not think that was the case. The hon. Member merely intended to say that the figures were misleading.

SIR F. BANBURY said he had no wish to charge the hon. Gentleman with any sinister attempt. The figures were misleading for this reason, that the hon. Gentleman had omitted to say that the outside area would benefit by £39,000, owing to the rate having been altered. In addition to that they would benefit by the alteration in the rateable value by, he thought, £10,000 odd, probably by £17,000. It was a great fallacy to make the allusion which had been made by the Member for South Dublin to other towns where he said there was uniformity. He totally forgot that London was not a single town. It was an agglomeration of a large number of different towns under different conditions. In the outside areas, not only did they gain benefit by rateable value being taken on a different basis, but it was perfectly known that the rent paid for land was much less than in London, whereas the amount consumed in water was as much or more. The man outside London paying £40 or so for his house and assessed at a very low valuation was using as much water as the man in the interior who might be paying £300. Was it fair to take the interior of London, which already paid large sums of money for its water, and sacrifice it to the outer areas, when the outer areas were obtaining their water at a very much less charge than the consumer in the interior? The matter was put in a nutshell when it was said that 3s. 7d. per 1,000 gallons was what was paid outside the area, and 6s. 9d. per 1,000 gallons inside. That was not fair. If there was to be uniformity, consumers should be put on something like an equal basis. The hon. Member's idea of uniformity was to allow those people who were paying too little to pay still less, and those people who were paying too much to pay a greater amount. The whole question turned on the fact that London was, as he said, an agglomeration of different towns, and that they could not in fairness, if they endeavoured, as they ought, to introduce some system in the different ratings, start with the idea, absolutely illusory, that each house was to be treated in the same way. It was making confusion worse confounded to take rateable value and assess it in one quarter in a different manner from in another. He had said all he had to say and he hoped hon. Members who were not hon. Members for London would understand that the question was vital for London. It was not often that London Members, absolutely regardless of Party, were found fighting together, and he thought that circumstance ought to have some weight with hon. Members who did not sit for London. What London Members were trying to do was to see that there should be some regard for justice in these charges, and that those people who were already favoured should not be still more favoured for no reason whatever.

*MR. T. McKINNON WOOD said it had been argued by the hon. Member for Kidderminster as a justification of the charge that the police rate was raised on rateable value. But that was one of the injustices under which London suffered, and why one injustice should be the excuse for another passed his comprehension. The fact that there would some day be a Bill for the reform of valuation in England was no reason why in the meantime London should suffer an injustice. The late Government prepared a Bill which was a very good Bill in some respects, but years had passed, and that Bill had never been carried by the House. They hoped that the President of the Local Government Board would bring in a Bill at an early date, but that was no reason why an injustice should be inflicted on London for a year or two. They did not object to equalisation, but the fact was that the new basis, while it brought about a nominal equality, brought about a real inequality. The amount involved had been said to be £10,000. That figure of £10,000 was arrived at by a fallacious calculation, and the nearest figure they could arrive at was £26,000. All that they were arguing was that London should not be subjected to an injustice amounting to £26,000 a year for no reason whatever. Who were the people who were in favour of that Amendment? London Members, both Conservative and Liberal, both Moderates and Progressives on the London County Council, a great majority of London Members on the Metropolitan Water Board, and the Finance Committee of the Water Board, headed by his friend Lord Welby, were against this proposal, and it was only carried with difficulty by the Water Board. He thought the Water Board was constructed on most unfortunate principles, and that this was a very good fulfilment of the prophecies some of them had ventured to make at the time of its construction that its peculiar constitution would inevitably lead to serious difficulties. Not a single argument had been advanced that evening why London should submit to that injustice, and he hoped that Members outside London would not assist to impose that injustice upon London.

*MR. LUKE WHITE said the question was one which lay very largely between inner London and outer London. The hon. Member for Islington had stated that the Amendment, if carried, would have the effect that in West Ham Union the Water Board could fix the rateable value as the basis for the water rate, while in another district it could fix the annual value, and that if they passed the Amendment they were leaving it to the Water Board to say what the basis of the rate was to be. When the case came before the Joint Committee they heard the arguments and witnesses on both sides and were so convinced that it was to the interests of London as a whole that rateable value should be taken both inside and outside London that the members of the Committee were absolutely unanimous that that was the proper course to take. They could not secure uniformity by adopting such a principle as that recommended by the hon. Member for Islington. They must take the rateable value both inside and outside London, and then the Water Board could go before the Assessment Committee and get the increase made, In the present circumstances he appealed to the House to support the Committee in the decision which it had come to, a decision which he would say again was only arrived at after hearing the arguments and witnesses for and against the proposal, and a decision which the Committee came to unanimously, that rateable value should be adopted both inside and outside the area.

*MR. JOHN BURNS: I, like the rest of the House, am regretful that we should have this discussion at this time in the morning. I am not responsible for it, and it cannot be helped. I believe that we ought, if possible, to get this Bill through to-night.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

*MR. JOHN BURNS: I express my view and I leave it there. I hope we may be able to do so, and I appeal to the House not to support the Amendment. I do this because there are many precedents why we should adopt the rateable value as a basis for water charges inside and outside the area of the County Council of London. The police rate, which extends over something like 600 square miles, is based on rateable value. The water charges in the County Council area are also based on rateable value. What is equally important, the Local Government Board for many years have always insisted on rateable value being taken as the basis for this and similar purposes. The Committee which had the whole of the facts before them in this particular Bill was under the impression that rateable value, as distinct from annual value, was the best form for assessment, particularly for obtaining a valuation on which a uniform rate should be charged. I believe that, particularly in the light of the growing area and population of the water supply both inside and outside London, any inequality there may be will soon be redressed. The responsibility for annual value outside London is not a liability or responsibility of the Water Board, but it is due to past Governments, but the responsibility for rateable value inside London is the responsibility of succeeding Governments. This Bill, which aims at equality of the incidence of both price and assessment, does approximate as near as it is possible for it to be done to a rough standard by means of which the inner and outer areas can be properly treated. If there is a discrepancy, that can only be remedied by the Government doing what I trust this Government will be able to do, and that is in a Valuation Bill to make uniformity of assessment if it is possible, not only inside and outside London, but throughout the country. What is more, if it is possible to apply it to outside areas as well as to London, we should have that excellent system of a quinquennial valuation by means of which we can get uniformity of assessment, rateable value, and prices for standard services such as water and many other things where uniformity of rateable value and assessment is needed. I can only say that if this Amendment were carried, the Water Board would regard it as being destructive.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why?

*MR. JOHN BURNS: The Water Board are as competent judges of how to conduct their business as the hon. Member who interjects.

ANOTHER HON. MEMBER: Do you associate yourself with the Water Board?

*MR. JOHN BURNS: I associate myself with the Water Board because we ought not to allow our personal views as to whether the Water Board and its constitution is or is not right to stand in the way of a genuine and serious attempt to get rough justice done by the establishment of rateable value both inside and outside the county of London. If we can do that consistently with not imposing any burden on London we ought to do it. The Water Board area is 514 square miles, and of this 400 square miles, with £7,500,000 rateable value, is outside London. The difference between annual value and rateable value in all that area is only £212,000, of which £156,000 is in Essex alone. If you exclude Essex the difference between the annual value and the rateable value all over the Water Board area is only £56,000. Translate that into revenue, and the difference is £10,000. For so small a difference we have no right to destroy this Bill. I can only say, this that the Essex County Council has adopted rateable value in the West Ham, East Ham, and Ilford Unions as a basis upon which to draw a number of their rates, and as a basis on which to establish a number of their county council charges. I would appeal to the hon. Member for Hampstead, who, like myself, has worked for many years in the service of London, not to allow this Amendment to stand in the way of the Water Board carrying out the duties and responsibilities which are committed to them, and which they will be unable to discharge with justice, equity, and fair play to London, both inside and outside the County Council area, if the Amendment is persisted in. I must appeal to the House of Commons to resist this Amendment, and also to come to a decision as soon as possible. I am as much convinced as are Members of the Committee who have spoken on the subject, that if the Amendment is carried, and rateable value is prevented from being the basis on which water prices should be charged, then it will mean the postponement indefinitely of the beginning of a settlement of this question. If rateable value is accepted as the basis, anything I can do as President of the Local Government Board to tone down inequalities, and to bring about as soon as possible by administrative action that thorough uniformity which this Bill is a step towards, I shall be only too pleased to do. If I could go further and say that in the Valuation Bill which I hope to introduce next year on behalf of His Majesty's Government provision could be made by means of which absolute equality both of assessment and charge could be secured in the entire area, I should be only too pleased to bend my energies in that direction. Having given that promise, I can only conclude by saying that I hope the House of Commons will support the Bill, and I appeal to them to do so.

*Mr. STRAUS said that he did not desire to keep the attention of the House at that hour of the night for a minute longer than was necessary, but he was forced to speak under the circumstances then existing by the action of the Government. He felt that this was such an important matter for London that if those who were not Members for London and who were showing signs of impatience liked to go home he saw no reason why they should not do so, seeing that the London Members were determined to prevent the Bill passing unless they got fair play for the ratepayers. A great deal had been said that night, particularly by the President of the Local Government Board, about prejudice in this matter. It might be that some of them were prejudiced against the Water Board, but the peculiar thing about the situation was that the Members for inner London were absolutely unanimous on the question excepting the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Battersea. How could there be any question of prejudice when Liberal and Conservative Members were enthusiastically combining together in support of the Amendment? It was a fact that when the President of the Local Government Board was a member of the London County Council he saw the inequality and absurdity of rateable value in the outside area being taken to be the same as the rateable value inside London, as he knew that outside they had no compulsory quinquennial valuation. He believed he was voicing the feeling of every Member who sat for inner London when he said that they wanted to know why they should not deal in exactly the same way with this question of water charges as they did in the London County Council with the contribution of the outside area towards main drainage. He submitted that the prejudice was all on the other side. He did not desire to kill the Bill, but if they were to be taunted with prejudice he could only say that he was sorry such a remark should be made, and that it would cause him to wish that the Bill was dead. From start to finish the Bill had never received the consideration that it ought to have had. He did not wish to say a word that was disrespectful about the members of the Committee, but it was a fact that there was not one Member on the Committee who understood the difficult question of the rating of London. Why were not some London Members put on the Committee? He represented a constituency in London which was very much interested in the Bill, and he was speaking on its behalf when he said that it was his duty to see when questions of prejudice were raised that they were put in the proper way. They had heard something that night about rough justice. He did not know much about rough justice, but he assured the House that if the Amendment was not passed it would be very rough on London. The right hon. Gentleman had again mentioned the question of the police. That was an injustice and an inequality which should not exist, but it ought not to be used as an argument in the present instance, except in favour of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Hampstead. The injustice at which the Amendment was aimed was one of which every Member who knew anything about the inequality of rating in London was well aware. He was pleased to hear that the President of the Local Government Board was desirous of doing something to get rid of the present anomalies, but if that desire had been really sincere he thought the right hon. Gentleman would have accepted the Amendment. He believed if any prejudice had been introduced it had not been by London Members, who, whether Liberals or Conservatives, were unanimous on this Amendment. He hoped the House would give the London Members credit for knowing what they wanted and that they would agree to the Amendment which was essentially fair and just.

MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E.) said he objected to the Bill for the very simple reason that the right hon. Member for Battersea, in order to get the measure through, had appealed to Members sitting for county constituencies, when he knew very well that his old colleagues on the London County Council were dead against him on the question. When hon. Members saw the President of the Local Government Board and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin vieing with each other as to who could give the most flattery, then he thought they would view what those Gentlemen said about the Bill with the greatest suspicion. He did not profess, for one instant, to be *au fait* with all the questions raised by the Bill, but he thought no one could have listened to the debate without coming to the conclusion quite impartially that the bulk of the evidence had proved that the inner area of London was suffering owing to the advantage given to the outer area. What he would venture to say was that he thought it was very inconsistent with the general policy of a democratic and Liberal Government to introduce a Bill affecting 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 of people and to try to rush it through by wearing out the endurance of the London Members at two o'clock in the morning. The President of the Local Government Board would not dare to go to a London constituency and take up the attitude on the Bill which he had done that night, provided that before he had a chance of addressing his audience the matter was impartially explained to them.

*MR. MORTON thought it was very much to be regretted, considering what a large matter this was, and how many millions of the people of the Metropolis it affected, that they should be driven to discuss it at that hour of the morning. He was bound to say that he did not think it was acting fairly either towards the people of London or towards their representatives in the House of Commons, who, they were told, were practically unanimously in favour of an alteration in the Bill. He did not like staying there at that hour of the morning, especially considering that he had been at the House since eleven o'clock on the previous day, and he thought nobody could say that they were not, at any rate, attempting by the time they devoted to their work to do their duty. He was not a London Member. His constituency was some 700 or 800 miles from London, but, knowing the importance of London to the United Kingdom, he had decided to stop and assist the poor Londoners to get justice done to them. With regard to this particular Amendment he was quite in favour of rateable value being the basis for these calculations, but in the outside areas, of which they had heard and which were affected by the proposal, there was no fair rateable value. If the Government wanted to be honest to the people of London they should take care that a proper rateable value was taken in the districts outside before these changes were made. It was no good to tell the House they were going to do it by-and-by. In the meantime they were going to rob the people of London of £56,000 per annum. He remembered when they made the settlement of 1885 and adopted rateable value as a basis for the water charges in London. They had just previous to that got the Dobb's judgment which fixed annual value, fair value, or something of that sort. They were not satisfied, because they held that, having got a quinquennial and proper valuation in the Metropolitan area, the rateable value was the fair value. It was acknowledged then that all over England and Wales there was no proper valuation, and until they got a proper and fair valuation the matter should rest. Let the change be made when the valuation was effected. The Government of the day had nothing to do with that rateable value business. The Bill was introduced by a private Member on the Tory side of the House. A Tory Government was then in power. The Bill was not passed till 1885, during which the Tory Government were in power a few months. They got the Local Government Board, then peopled by Tories, to assist them in the matter, and having got the Bill through the House after twelve o'clock at night, they sent it up to the House of Lords. He remembered being one of the Committee that had charge of the matter outside the House, and he remembered going to see the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City, who was then at the Local Governmen Board, to ask him to assist them. They eventually got the Bill, which was not a Government Bill—not even a Liberal Bill—fixing for London a rateable value, which was then a quinquennial valuation, as the basis for water charges. If there was a quinquennial or proper valuation for outside London he would agree that rateable value was right, but let them not give up what they had. They had got by the Water Bill of 1903, or whatever time it was passed, an annual value fixed for these outside districts, as the valuation upon which they should contribute towards the charges of the Metropolitan Water Board. It would be admitted by everybody who understood anything about it that it was not at all necessary for them to blame personally the Water Board or its members, because they were in this difficulty — that they were compelled by Parliament to go and buy up these unjust charges upon the people, and therefore they now had to find the money. But they were not bound to remove or release these outside people from the charges placed on them by Parliament which apparently said their contribution was to be on annual and not rateable value. He thought, therefore, before Parliament made that change and gave the rest of the country a proper valuation they should continue to charge on the annual value, and do justice to London, which he, coming all the way from Cape Wrath, told them had been treated very ill in this matter.

*Sir JOHN BETHELL (Essex, Romford) said the question was very important for London, but it was also a very important question for London over the border. The consumers in London over the border were prepared to pay their full price for a supply of water, but if they were to pay on annual value they asked that those inside should pay on annual value. They were prepared to pay on the same basis as consumers in the metropolis. The matter was developing into an inner or outer London question. They were both partners in the undertaking and they both wanted the inner and outer ring alike to pay a fair price for the supply of water. Personally he was grateful to the President of the Local Government Board for the way in which he had taken the case in hand. He assumed the House would not allow the people over the London border to pay a higher rate than those in the inner ring. He pointed out that at present a man who paid a weekly rent of 15s. in London paid for his supply of water £1 a year. Outside London a house let at 15s. a week paid £1 5s. a year. Under this Bill the people in the outer ring would pay about 5 per cent. more than the people within London, who were really not giving them anything, when over the border they had been paying much higher prices. The Bill would simply give them the justice to which they were entitled. The East London Water Company had exacted the last shilling from them. They were now under a Water Board, and they had their representative on the Board and they expected to pay the same price as the people in the metropolis.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 64; Noes, 101. (Division List No. 308.)

AYES.

Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bowerman, C. W.
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor, C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, CH (Sussex, E Grinst'.)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Courthorpe, G. Lloyd
Dalrymple, Viscount
Gretton, John
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hedges, A. Paget
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S Edm'ds)
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Horniman, Emslie John
Hunt, Rowland
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morpeth, Viscount
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
O'Donnell, C. W. (Walworth)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darl'gton)
Percy, Earl
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Radford, G. H.
Rendall, Athelstan
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seaverns, J. H.
Smith, F. E. (Liverp'l, Walton)
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Starkey, John R.
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thompson, W Mitchell-(Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Waterlow, D. S.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Fletcher and Mr. Dickinson.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland-Hood, Rt Hn Sir Alex. F
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bertram, Julius
Brodie, H. C.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Causton, Rt Hn Richard Knight
Cave, George
Clough, William
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cullinan, J.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Forster, Henry William
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazleton, Richard
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hogan, Michael
Holt, Richard Durning
Hudson, Walter
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Meagher, Michael
Mond, A.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'y, Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Cent'rl)
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mt'n)
Richardson, A.
Roberts, Charles A. (Lincoln)
Roberts G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'd)
Robinson, S.
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V.H. (Brentford)
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Som'rs'tE)
Thorne, William
Valentia, Viscount
Walsh, Stephen
Whitbread, Howard
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, Jn. Henry (Halifax)
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, J. W. (Wor'stersh, N.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir John Bethell and Mr. Barnard.

SIR WILLIAM BULL moved a new clause providing for the application of a part of the surplus revenue of the Board to reduction of charges for water supplied by measure. He said he had stated very much earlier in the debate that he did not quite understand the compromise suggested by the President of the Local Government Board. He would like to make his position clear and would make a general statement to the President of the Local Government Board.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must confine his observations to the subject-matter of the clause.

SIR WILLIAM BULL said he begged to move the clause which was for the application of part of surplus revenue to the reduction of charges for water supplied by measure. He wished to point out to the House the position with reference to the difference between the rateable value and other values. For instance, one of the difficulties which the small consumer had to face in supply by measure was that in the case of a large mercantile office, or a bank, in London, at present there was a very small consumption of water, say not more than 6,000 gallons per quarter, and for that at present he paid £6 or £7. At the end of the year that came to about £30 for 30,000 gallons of water or £1 per 1,000 gallons. Under the new scheme whereby the rateable value was taken that office would be charged five or six times as much if there happened to be a housekeeper on the premises and inhabited house duty had to be paid. The proprietor of that office or business premises——

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member has said nothing which is in the least relevant to this clause.

SIR WILLIAM BULL said he was trying to come to it. He would move the clause as it was and reserve his remarks till they were relevant.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member does not move the clause.

SIR WILLIAM BULL said he did move it, but would not detain the House, as he wanted to get ready for his next speech.

A new clause—

"(1) If the receipts on revenue account exceed the expenditure on that account of the Board in any year, one-fourth of the excess shall, notwithstanding anything contained in the Act of 1902, be carried to a separate account in the books of the Board and ear-marked as applicable to the reduction of the charges for the time being made by the Board for supply of water by measure in pursuance of the section of this Act whereof the marginal note is 'Supply by measure'; (2) all moneys carried to a separate account and ear-marked in pursuance of subsection (1) of this section shall be accumulated from time to time until they amount to not less than two pounds ten shillings per centum upon the amount for one year of the charges to reduction of which they are applicable and shall then be applied and distributed by way of a special discount or rebate upon such charges at a rate of not less than two pounds ten shillings per centum per annum."

Brought up and read a first time.

Motion made and Question, "That the clause be read the second time," put and negatived.

*MR. COOPER (Southwark Bermondsey) moved an Amendment to transfer the cost of laying and maintaining communication pipes from the consumers to the Water Board. He said his Amendment would affect a large number of owners and occupiers of houses. The Water Board brought the water down the street in the main, but the owner of a house had to put in the communicating pipe and put in the cock in the street by which the Board cut off the water if its rate was not paid, and also a specially prescribed tap to prevent waste. Under the water companies the cock and tap could only be purchased at an extravagant cost from a limited company the shareholders of which were the leading officials of the water company. Gas and electricity were brought to one side of the meter. He had never seen why the water company should make the occupier put in the communication pipes while the gas company should do it for him. On those grounds he moved the Amendment.

LORD R. CECIL seconded. He said the laughter with which the hon. Member's observations had been received showed the need for the adjournment of the discussion. The Amendment was put forward by an hon. Member who knew the conditions of London life as well as any Member of the House. He had put forward the Amendment in a perfectly serious speech, and it was received in a way which was not becoming to the House of Commons.

Amendment proposed to the Bill.

"In page 2, to leave out lines 24, and 25."—(*Mr. Cooper.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

*MR. JOHN BURNS: The noble Lord entirely misinterpreted the hilarity which greeted the remarks of the hon. Member, and which was due to the hon. Member's display of subtle humour, and not to any ironical feeling on the part of the House. The Amendment would be contrary to the general practice which prevails with water companies. The Amendment really means that the Water Board shall pay for and maintain the communicating pipes that are now paid for and maintained by private owners. The universal practice is for this to be done at the expense of the consumer. If these charges were suddenly put on the Water Board who have had the greatest difficulty in securing a small margin of £9,000, following a deficit in the previous year of £10,000, it would cause the Water Board to pay for special and privileged users at the expense of the ratepayers. It is not the intention of the House that the Water Board should be so handicapped. These charges are now borne by private owners, and until the Water Board has a substantial surplus out of which they might be expected to make a contribution for other purposes, it would be placing an intolerable burden on their shoulders if these charges were transferred to them.

SIR WILLIAM BULL said he begged to move the adjournment of the debate. He wished to say a word or two in regard to it. He wished with great respect to make his position clear.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must bear in mind the Standing Order which says that all his remarks must be relevant to the motion for the adjournment.

SIR WILLIAM BULL said it was now extremely late, it was half-past two and the Bill had been debated since eleven o'clock. The President of the Local Government Board and himself came to a certain arrangement which he had hoped would be carried out. The Bill was an extremely valuable one, and he had no wish to see it lost, but he wished to get from the right hon. Gentleman an assurance in regard to it.. It seemed to him that it would save the time of the House if he could make his position clear. He proposed that certain Amendments which he had put down should all be withdrawn and that he should retire from his opposition on behalf of those for whom he was acting. He was very desirous, however, of protecting the small consumers and he was anxious to hear a few words from the President of the Local Government Board on that question. He thought that certain suggestions might come from the right hon. Gentleman which would enable hon. Members to go home, and to enable the President of the Local Government Board to state his views he moved the adjournment of the debate. He believed that if the contending parties were afforded an opportunity of having one more conference the Bill would pass through the House in a very short time.

SIR F. BANBURY seconded the Motion.

*MR. JOHN BURNS said the hon. Member for Hampstead had referred to an attempt which he made to bring the contending parties in this matter together with a view to an amicable settlement. He thought the hon. Member would admit that in round figures they had been able to satisfy the traders and manufacturers on the particular point upon which the hon. Member had spoken to him. They had been able to secure from the Water Board £3,000 more than would have met the total bulked claims of the friends of the hon. Member for Hammersmith, but the sum of £24,000 had been so allocated and distributed as not to bring within the purview of its benevolence those smaller consumers for whose interests the hon. Member for Hammersmith had shown much care.

That was not due to any fault on his (Mr. Burns's) part, but it was due to the fact that both large and small traders expressed their willingness to accept the £24,000. It was said that the small consumers had not received the concessions to which they were entitled. He was quite willing, if the hon. Member for Hammersmith would accept his public assurance, and would allow him to press in his own way—and he would do it as soon as possible—to press the strong claims of the smaller consumers on the Water Board, to convey both the spirit and the letter of the hon. Member's request to the Water Board with a strong expression of the hope that they would be able to meet him. If, having received that public assurance, the hon. Member would do him the honour of withdrawing his Amendment, he, for his part, would do his very best to recommend the claims of the smaller consumer to the generous consideration of the Water Board. The hon. Member had said that he would not press the Amendment if he got a satisfactory answer, and he hoped that what he had said on the point would meet his wishes.

Mr. H. W. FORSTER (Kent, Sevenoaks) hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would accept the very reasonable Motion which his hon. friend had made. He spoke as one who had consistently supported the right hon. Gentleman in the proceedings connected with the Bill, and he could not help thinking that if the right hon. Gentleman would agree to the Motion for the adjournment of the debate the further discussion of the Bill might go through in a far shorter time on some subsequent occasion than must necessarily be consumed if the debate were continued that night. Personally he would be exceedingly sorry if the Bill were lost, and he thought it would stand a really better chance of passing if the Government accepted the Motion. In that case the debate could be resumed at a more reasonable hour at some not far distant date.

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. George Whiteley, Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey) said that in all probability from now until the end of the session private business would invariably have to be taken after eleven o'clock at night. The House would understand, therefore, that he had some little hesitation in agreeing to the Motion. But if it was intended that the further proceedings on the Bill should take only a very little time he did not see why his right hon. friend should not agree to accept the Motion. He must, however, repeat his expression of the hope that if an arrangement was come to the adjourned debate would occupy very little time.

Mr. JOHN BURNS said that he should be only too pleased to fall in with any reasonable request, made from any section of the House, that would tend to facilitate the passing of the Bill. If the adjournment of the debate at that juncture would enable that result to be brought about he willingly consented to it. He trusted, however, that if he on his part did his best to bring about a settlement that would satisfy the smaller consumer, hon. Members would do their best to keep to the bargain and would allow the Bill to go through.

Sir F. BANBURY: No bargain.

Mr. JOHN BURNS said that in the circumstances he had named the Government agreed to the adjournment of the debate.

Question put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed this day, at a quarter past Eight of the clock.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn"—(*Mr. Whiteley*)—put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at twenty-one minutes before Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, 24th July, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill [H.L.]; Tynemouth Corporation (Water) Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3868. China (Pakhoi).

RAILWAY EMPLOYMENT (SAFETY APPLIANCES).

Reports of the Committee appointed by the Board of Trade to examine and where necessary to test appliances designed to diminish danger to men employed in railway service, together with the appendices thereto.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Report by Dr. W. Leslie Mackenzie and Captain A. Foster on a collection of statistics as to the physical condition of children attending the public schools of the school board for Glasgow, with relative tables and diagrams.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Order of the day for Standing Order No. XXXIX. to be considered in order to its being suspended for this day's sitting; read, and discharged.

LORD CROMER.

*THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, I have to inform your Lordships that a Gracious Message has been received from His Majesty the King.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN) read the King's Message, which was as follows:—

> "His Majesty, having taken into consideration the eminent services rendered by the Earl of Cromer, O.M., G.C.B., G.C.M.G., K.C.S.I., C.I.E., former Agent and Consul-General in Egypt, and being desirous, in recognition of such services, to confer upon him some signal mark of His favour, recommends to the House of Lords that they should concur in granting Lord Cromer the sum of £50,000."

*THE EARL OF CREWE: Perhaps I may be allowed to state that I am unable at this moment to give notice of the day when this Message shall be taken into consideration, but it will be early next week, and I hope to make a Motion to-morrow naming the precise day.

OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITIES.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF BIRMINGHAM: My Lords, I rise to ask whether, in view of the changes that have taken place in English higher education since the Report of the University Commission of 1877, and the difficulties experienced by the older Universities as at present constituted in adapting themselves to modern conditions, the Government will advise His Majesty to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the endowment, government, administration, and teaching of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge and their constituent colleges in order to secure the best use of their resources for the benefit of all classes of the community. I suppose that it would surprise no one that there should be a number of people anxious that such a Question should be asked and that such a Commission should be appointed. The principle of the right of the nation to inquire by means of a Commission may be regarded as having been established by the Commissions of 1855 and 1877. Most people would be disposed to admit that, while those Commissions made some mistakes, their appointment marked definite stages of progress in the reform of the Universities. It is partly because they undoubtedly made mistakes that some of us are anxious to be able to look forward to the appointment of another great inquiry to inaugurate or assist another great period of reform.

But there is another and a larger reason. Undoubtedly within the last thirty years immense changes have taken place in the higher education of the country—changes so immense that, unless the University is to fall out of the relation which it ought to hold to the whole education of the country, it is inevitable that reforms should be required.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

To an even greater extent, a fundamental change in the balance of power in the classes which form the English nation has taken place. It has always been the honour and the pride of the old Universities that they trained the governing classes of the country. We have heard that said very often, and indeed it is a noble function to assign to a University, but it is impossible to consider the present situation in the country without seeing that the term "governing classes of the country" has received a very wide extension. For example, it includes now the working classes. There is a very real desire for the diffusion of higher education, and it is hardly possible to exaggerate the need for permeating those classes which are playing, and are destined to play, so increasingly an important part in the government of the country with the best education which we have to offer.

We want to know whether the University could not be brought into more immediate, direct, and effective relations to all those who really desire to be students and to profit by the best education the country can afford. I am asking this question of the Government at the request of a number of persons both inside and outside the Universities, and besides those for whom I am allowed to make myself the mouthpiece there are others, such, for example, as the writers of the letter in *The Times* this morning, who experience the same desire. There is a desire that the Government should intimate an intention of appointing a Commission, but at the same time should delay its actual appointment for a year or two to give the Universities, as it were, a period of time to reform themselves.

But I desire, if your Lordships will allow me, to indicate somewhat more at large what seems to me the grounds on which this kind of inquiry can rightly be asked for. First of all—and I begin where I think the need for reform strikes most obviously on the eye of the outside observer—I venture to think that there can be no reasonable doubt that at present our ancient Universities are allowed to become to an extent altogether beyond what ought to be tolerated a playground for the sons of the wealthier classes. Every now and then there is a disturbance—a row—at a University, which is taken hold of by the newspapers and causes people to hold up their hands. That kind of local disturbance will occur from time to time wherever there is a large collection of high-spirited young men. But all the time that these things are at suitable intervals held up to reprobation, there is another far deeper and more real evil which passes almost altogether unobserved, and that is, that as at present constituted the Universities are to a very large extent not in any serious sense places of study at all. We go about among those whose sons are at the Universities, and it would be comic, if it were not much too serious a matter for comedy, to find how normally it is supposed that the young men go to the Universities to amuse themselves. Our sympathy is constantly asked for Tom or Charles because the poor boy has got to work so hard for an examination, it being manifestly supposed that this interval of strenuous study—which, when you examine it, you find to be not so very strenuous—is only an unnatural interruption of the more ordinary and normal occupations of that agreeable place of residence. Though we are very familiar with all that, yet if you seriously consider the extent of it, it altogether passes the limits which ought to be tolerated.

There are a vast number of young men who never in any kind of way attain to the position of students—they never acquire the instinct or the power of getting knowledge out of books. The Universities should have far more stringent and effective machinery for getting rid of those who have neither the ability nor the intention of becoming students. This means a very wide reform in the methods of the Universities, but it is only one of the many forms in which the well-to-do classes to-day are being asked whether they mean to take life and its obligations seriously. I believe that if we had this machinery in an effective form for getting rid of those who have no real intention of becoming students, then there would follow easily and inevitably an immense change in the system of examinations and the system of teaching in the Universities. Tutors and other conscientious people have somehow to get these young men through their examinations, and thus it comes about that much too large a part of the energies of the teaching staffs at Oxford and Cambridge is occupied in getting for these young men knowledge out of books and presenting it to them in a form to which they ought to be required to reduce it for themselves. If those who had no real intention of becoming students were got rid of, the teachers would have more time for study and for the teaching which more properly belongs to a University; and a great deal more teaching power would be liberated for the system of University extension in the real sense—namely, for the purpose of teaching, not popular audiences, but trained and sifted students in different parts of the country, so that the influence of the University might be extended to those who are hungering and thirsting for that sort of knowledge and training which a University is able to supply.

Then I come to another matter, and one which is always thought of prominently when the reform of the Universities is in question—the use of endowments. We are all alive to the fact that the endowments of the colleges were given in very large part for the training of poor students; and we are also alive to the fact that people of very humble origin have been enabled by these endowments to get an education which it would have been beyond the means of their parents to afford, and to rise to the highest place in Church and State and to do the greatest service to their country. I suppose it will not be denied that a very large part of the endowments of scholars and exhibitioners at the present time goes to those who could in any case be at Oxford or Cambridge. It is very difficult even to give any kind of approximate suggestion of the state of things in regard to numbers, but the other day someone well acquainted with both Oxford and Cambridge calculated that two in five of the scholars of the colleges did not in fact need the endowment in order to enable them to go there. I do not think it can be denied that the unlimited belief in open competitive examinations which characterised the last Commission has had effects which the reformers of those days never contemplated. Open competition has not really proved to be competition open to all classes; it has given an immense advantage to those whose parents were in a position to supply them with education of the more expensive kind. As a matter of fact, I expect it would be found that the Universities do less now than they did generations ago to provide the crown of the educational ladder of the country.

There is a large number of people who believe it was a great mistake to destroy altogether the local connections of the colleges, and that it would be an advantage to re-establish them if they were re-established over a wide enough area. If the Universities could get rid of the great body of those who have not the slightest intention of using the University as a place of study, there would be room for the employment of the endowments to do what we should all admit is the highest function of a University—namely, to provide a centre for the educational aspirations and desire for knowledge of the whole country.

It is often said that Englishmen do not believe in knowledge. But there is in every class of Englishmen a very large number of individuals who have a passion for knowledge. The Workers' Educational Association and the Ruskin College at Oxford are signs and evidences that among the working classes there is a very considerable body of people who desire to be students and are capable of becoming students. What we want is that the Universities should be so reorganised and that their endowments should be so used as that, whatever there is of real intellectual aspiration and real desire for knowledge, should find its home and instruction in Oxford and Cambridge; and that, and nothing else, should be the real object which the Universities manifestly exist to serve.

As to the use of post-graduate endowments, there seems to be wide agreement that the system of prize Fellowships as it was established by the last Commission was a mistake — that post-graduate endowments should be used to subsidise either those who are to be teachers or those who are engaged in researches such as are worthy of advanced students. It is a complete misuse of University endowments to give them to young men simply that they may carry them away and tide over the years of briefless barristership or the time before they are able to get into practice in medicine, or in any other profession. These kind of exhibitions may be very desirable things, but, if so, they should be supplied from some other quarter than from the endowments of a University.

In order to redress the balance between the wealth of the colleges and the poverty of the University the principle has been established that the colleges should contribute to the needs of the University. But there is a widespread idea that certain colleges have in recent years grown very wealthy, and that the subsidies from the colleges to the University are in a number of cases very inadequate. If another Commission were appointed it would be part of the duty of that Commission to inquire into the uses made of the college endowments, as well as the University endowments, and, perhaps, carry further the principle established by the last Commission of contribution from the colleges to the University.

There are other points on which I should like to say a word by way of removing the objection which would undoubtedly be felt with regard to such a proposal as that which I am venturing to make. First of all, it is sometimes said that what we want to do by these proposed reforms is to divert Oxford and Cambridge from the kind of education which they have supplied and fostered and to make them like the Universities of Birmingham or Leeds—that is to say, largely technical and professional. I venture to say that nothing is further from the minds of those who are known as reformers in Oxford and Cambridge. They desire, and I desire, and in my experience those of the working classes who are most interested in this movement desire, that the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge should not assimilate themselves to the younger Universities, but should retain that colour and character which merciful traditions have stamped upon them.

Oxford is specially distinguished in the study of philosophy, in literature, and in history. By all means let it be in studies of this kind that Oxford should continue to be distinguished. It is by this kind of studies that it can best do the work the country wants it to do. There is one particular direction of study which I desire to see brought to the front in our old Universities, and that is what I may call political, or social, or economic science. One chief defect in our public schools is that they have really done as nearly nothing as possible to train young Englishmen in the idea of citizenship. The same thing is true about the Universities. The best of those who are engaged in municipal life feel that the Universities, by their professed and official training, and by the spirit they impress on the men who come out of them, are doing very much less than they might do to supply and enrich municipal and public life.

There will be those who will say, let the Universities reform themselves. Some of those most ardent for reform have written to me saying, We want great and drastic reform, but do not let us have a Commission for a year or two; let the subject be examined and let it be in the air; let the Government announce that it is manifest that such a Commission will be required; but let the Universities have a little time to set their house in order, and do what they can do themselves. If His Majesty's Government think that that kind of delay is desirable, I for my part should be wholly in favour of giving the Universities time, under some external stimulus, to do the best for themselves. But in the long run it is quite obvious that if the Universities are to reform themselves there will be points where a commission of inquiry must be necessary; or, at any rate, something must be necessary which prepares the way for legislation, without which some of the most manifestly necessary reforms cannot be accomplished.

Almost the most unjustifiable method of government which could be imagined for a great institution like a University is that which is provided in the ultimate dominance of convocation in the University of Oxford. A miscellaneous body of persons like that are sure to look upon proposed changes with that unwillingness for change which we are all apt to feel towards anything in which we have ourselves been interested and occupied in our youth. They are the very last kind of body to be an effective judge of necessary or unnecessary changes. But that is a matter which cannot be altered without the assistance of Parliament. What I suppose we all desire is that the old Universities should become what at times in past history they have been—the real centre for the intellectual aspirations and the desire for knowledge of all classes of the community, and that the endowments of the Universities should be used for those whose parents could not otherwise provide for them the advantage of the best training, consecrated by the highest tradition which the country affords. It is because I love Oxford as one only could love it who has passed some sixteen years of his life there, and because I desire that Oxford and Cambridge should again take, or should continue to take, their proper place as the centre of the intellectual aspirations of the whole country, that I put to the noble Earl the Lord President of the Council the Question standing in my name.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF BRISTOL: My Lords, there are two words in the question of the Bishop of Birmingham on which it seems to me necessary that something should be said. The two words are "and Cambridge." Our Chancellor the Duke of Devonshire is not able to be here. I wrote to the one surviving member of the late Cambridge Commission, Lord Rayleigh, to ask him if he could be here, and he replied that he could not. It therefore seemed to fall to me, as having been secretary of that Commission, and having for a number of years had as much as any other single person to do with the work of the Cambridge University, to say something on this occasion.

The impression which was made upon me by the Bishop of Birmingham's speech was that, as far as Cambridge is concerned, the right rev. Prelate must have been exceedingly fast asleep for the last twenty-five or thirty years; and he seems to be still asleep. My object will be to put some facts before your Lordships to show that Cambridge has adapted itself to modern conditions. In reading the Question on the Paper I was very much puzzled by a number of things in it. The right rev. Prelate refers to the Report of the University Commission in 1877. I do not know of any such Report. I remember asking the chairman of the Commission whether we should draw up a Report, and he said "our statutes are our Report." It is true that the Commission was appointed in 1877, but the late Queen confirmed the Statutes in 1882, and there is a great difference between the two years. The Bishop of Birmingham also speaks of the constituent colleges of the University. That is to me a surprising constitutional position, for the University of Cambridge is independent of the colleges.

Then it is proposed to inquire into our endowment, government, administration, and teaching. No inquiry is wanted in any one of those particulars. I have in my hand a publication, which can be obtained for 3d., where you can see every single detail of the endowments of Cambridge; and a like publication, at the same cost, giving the details of the income and expenditure of all the colleges. As to government, about three pages in the University calendar will tell you all about that; and as to teaching, information is easily available from an interesting little book called the "Students Guide to Cambridge." Therefore I hope that, so far as Cambridge is concerned, His Majesty's Government will not trouble the Commissioners with an inquiry.

I now turn to the great point—namely, that the Universities as at present constituted experience difficulties in adapting themselves to modern conditions. I have been at pains to prepare a list of the various honour examinations in the University of Cambridge, and this shows in what a very large proportion the men now enter for the new triposes as compared with the old, the University having adapted itself to modern conditions. Last year 180 men presented themselves in the two old triposes, mathematics and classics, while 465 men presented themselves in the new triposes. Instead of Cambridge being as the right rev. Prelate suggested, a place for poll men, more than half the whole number of men belonging to that year took their degree in an honours tripos. The relative numbers are interesting. Dealing only with Part I. of such triposes as have two parts in two successive years, seventy-three men came out in the mathematical tripos (the number was 140 in Lord Courtney's year, 1855), ninety-six in the classical, four in moral science, 137 in natural sciences, thirty-four in theology, ninety-two in law, fifty-nine in history, four in oriental languages, ten in mediæval and modern languages, twenty-seven in mechanical sciences, and five in economics ; 541 men in all. In the more advanced and specialised parts of four triposes which have two parts, the men of one or two years higher standing came out to the number of ninety-four. Besides these more advanced parts of triposes, we have that which the right rev. Prelate desiderated, a very close link with research. In the last ten years, of the many men who have devoted themselves to post-graduate study and research, sixty-six have passed through a complete course and have received their certificates as "advanced research students," forty-seven of them in the very costly laboratories, and nineteen in other fields of research.

I should like to give a little information in regard to the two latest triposes—mechanical science and economics. The buildings of the mechanical science department now contain lecture-room accommodation which seats about 360 students simultaneously, a drawing office for a class of ninety, two rooms for elementary heat and mechanics, a boiler-room, an engine-room with ten heat-engines of different types, arranged so that the measurement of all quantities concerned may be systematically made by the students, a large room for dealing with strength of materials and with hydraulics, a dynamo-room fitted with various kinds of dynamos, a motor-room fitted with motors of all the usual types, and several other rooms for special purposes. That sounds to me rather like modern conditions, and I cannot imagine that the Bishop of Birmingham is aware of all these things. As to economics, the most recent of all the triposes, I will give a list of what may be studied there. The advanced portion of it includes such subjects as modern methods of production, transport, and marketing, trusts, the recent development of joint-stock companies, railway and shipping organisation and rates, banking systems, stock exchanges, foreign exchanges, investment markets, international aspects of credit and currency, tariffs, and so on. That, again, sounds to me fairly modern.

In addition we have boards for Indian Civil servants and for Foreign Service students ; for agricultural sciences, with professors and readers and diplomas ; geographical studies, military studies, mining engineering with diplomas, forestry, and, for teachers, a day training college. Besides this we have our hands upon all the various classes of the community, so far as education is concerned, to whom the Bishop of Birmingham referred. By means of affiliated colleges and local lectures—the local lectures were instituted by Cambridge for the special purpose of doing precisely what the Bishop of Birmingham has described—we send skilled men from Cambridge, accustomed to teach there, down to the great centres, and there students are collected to whom these men lecture exactly as they lecture in their own college or University rooms. That has had the most wonderful effect in drawing the University and various classes of the community together. A little time before we did that there was a proposal that one or two of the Cambridge colleges should be suppressed and the funds devoted to a big centre in the Midlands or elsewhere ; but the result of two or three years working of local centres was this, that if anyone proposed to touch any of the old institutions in Cambridge, those very people who had been clamouring for the money would say, "No, we will have the prestige of the University maintained."

The examination of Public Schools and the local examinations cover all the secondary, and very much of the higher, education ; and the training of teachers touches down to the elementary school teachers, and gives them two or three terms at least at the University. How in the world the University, or any body in existence, or that could be introduced, could have its hand more completely on all classes of the community so far as education is concerned I am at a loss to conceive. To such an extent is our external work carried that last year the syndicate of which I was secretary for a great many years had passed through its hands no less a sum than £31,000, received from local examinations and lectures, and disbursed to examiners, lecturers, and so on. That is in itself no small testimony to the fact that we have in a most remarkable degree got our hands educationally on all classes of the community.

We have heard a good deal about large endowments Last year I find that the endowment of the University of Cambridge from its own property, which it can spend as it will, is half as much again as when I left the University, and that it has now reached the large sum of £1,965 6s. 4d. The quarterly payments from members are £14,500—the right rev. Prelate spoke with contempt of non-residents; I do not feel contempt for £14,500 a year—fees for degrees £28,000; and oddments £1,000; which, with £30,300 received from the colleges, make altogether a total receipt of £75,000 or £76,000. There are besides trust funds for various professorships, scholarships, studentships, and prizes. The estates of the Colleges produce £220,000, while fees, rent of rooms, etc., amount to £90,000. The estate management of that £220,000 cost only 7 per cent., but the management, rates, taxes, improvements, and cost of the great national monuments, which the College buildings are, come to £130,000. This leaves a net amount for all purposes of £180,000. Of this, scholarships absorb £32,000. The Bishop of Birmingham said that the two Commissions had done much harm in alienating and really putting into the hands of wealthy people the scholarship fund which was meant for the poor, and thus deprived poor men of the advantages of a University education. It was not the Commissioners who did that. The mischief was done when the country grammar schools were deprived of the right to teach Greek during school hours, and thus ceased to be feeders of the Universities. In the old times, whenever a poor man's son was found to have marked ability, a local school was available and he was passed on to the University. In this way the nation gained some of the ablest men in history. It was not the Commissioners who altered that.

As to scholarships and fellowships falling to the sons of wealthy parents, it was a statute of the Commissioners that those who did not need the emoluments might surrender them, while retaining the honour that they had won. I repudiate the suggestion, as far as Cambridge was concerned, that the Commissioners took what was intended for the poor and gave it to the rich. They devoted much time and most sympathetic consideration to the remedy of the evil which they found established. But there must always be a difficulty in taking poverty into account in an examination. The Master of Trinity declared that it was impossible, "for," said he, "how much poverty makes up for a false quantity?" The average emolument of the heads of houses is £882, and that of the Fellows is £200. Nor is this the result of agricultural depression. I only held my fellowship for two years, for in those days it was thought worth while to surrender a fellowship for a wife. In my first year I received a pound or two less than £200, and in my second year a pound or two more, and I had to pay for everything I ate and drank out of that sum, so that these things are not the enormous prizes they are supposed to be.

The right rev. Prelate the Bishop of Birmingham spoke of the Commissioners having created a system of prize fellowships. It is not the case that the Commissioners created prize fellowships. They cut them down. Before the Commission, a man could get his fellowship, go out of residence, never come near the college again, and draw the income of his fellowship all his life. The Cambridge Commission cut that down to six years. There are few prize fellowships now, and they are becoming fewer. Out of forty fellows in two colleges only two are non-resident, and one of these two was lately elected to a professorship in another University, so his could not be a very bad case.

It is to be remembered that an enormous army of college servants has to be maintained, and on this item alone £34,000 a year has to be spent. Altogether a balance of £32,000 is left of the income of the colleges, and of that sum £30,000 goes to the University.

My object has been served if I have at all shown that we in Cambridge at least have adapted ourselves, even under our supposed restrictions and limitations to modern conditions. Indeed, I cannot conceive that it is possible to adapt ourselves more to modern conditions than we have done. But if His Majesty's Government determines to issue a Commission to Cambridge, it will be received, not only respectfully, but willingly; for a Commission may cut some knots which the University cannot, or will not, cut for itself. One of these is the question of Greek. Science students ought to be allowed to pass their examinations without a knowledge of Greek. As to voting in the Senate, it is seldom that the non-residents take any part at all. For twenty-one years I myself drafted every regulation with regard to the external work of the University, all being in direction of progress, and in no single case was there a vote in the Senate against any of those regulations. Only this morning the chief creator of the important school of mechanical sciences told me that his experience was exactly the same.

I only desire His Majesty's Government to be quite clear that a Commission to inquire is not wanted at Cambridge. All the facts are known. The stricter and closer the reference, and the shorter the time during which the University is kept in a state of unrest, the better. I suggest a small statutory Commission which would be able to make statutes having the force of law. It should be composed of experts who are not faddists, and who have full sympathy for the new as well as full respect for the old. The Government would, I trust, issue two Commissions, one for Oxford, and one for Cambridge. Let them give the Bishop of Birmingham all he asks for; but not one-tenth part is necessary for Cambridge. The Government might well, in grateful recognition of the remarkable manner in which Cambridge has adapted itself, in spite of restricted means, to modern conditions, reply to this question that they will secure to the University an additional £75,000 a year.

*LORD ELLENBOROUGH: My Lords, in spite of what the right rev. Prelate the Bishop of Bristol has said, I think there is need for a thorough and searching examination by a Royal Commission. If I am rightly informed compulsory Greek is required at Cambridge—against the wishes of the more enlightened graduates who reside there—by the Bœotians of the University, by men who earn their living by teaching Greek in other places, and who, as protectionists of their own trade, are desirous of seeing the study of that fetish enforced on all undergraduates so as to prevent their wares becoming unsaleable.

These Bœotians form the most mischievous trade union in the United Kingdom, and it would pay this country well to double the emoluments of nine-tenths of the teachers of the Greek language on condition of their abandoning their profession, as they cannot exercise it without wasting the valuable time of the flower of our youth. Furthermore, I consider that the greatest enemies of Greek culture are those who make use of Greek poetry in teaching Greek grammar, thereby causing its beauty to be lost in a jungle of rules unknown to Homer or to Sophocles. These rules have mostly been invented by men who could neither speak nor pronounce correctly a word of the language they presumed to teach.

The injury to education caused by this universal study of dead languages extends far beyond the limits of Oxford and Cambridge. Public schools chiefly prepare for the Universities whether the parents wish their sons to go on to one of them or not. Private schools prepare in like manner for the public schools. The result is that thousands of boys have their minds cribbed, cabined, and confined, because other boys wish to compete for scholarships. They are thus specialised for the Church and the Bar at an early age, contrary to the wishes of many of their parents, so that later in life they find themselves heavily handicapped when they come into competition with men who have been educated at what are considered to be lower grade schools.

The chief advantage of what is called a classical education consists in the acquisition of a knowledge of history. This is generally taught concurrently with the dead languages. It is much to be regretted that technical and middle-class schools so seldom give their pupils sufficient opportunities and inducements to learn history. If every voter knew something of the political successes and failures of other nations and of their causes, this country would be much better governed. The man who has studied history has a large fund of human experiences to draw upon in addition to his own. It is the knowledge of history that distinguishes the statesman from the politician and the stump orator. I do not wish the teachers of dead languages to starve, and I think that there is an opening for them if they would undertake the task of teaching history. To paraphrase the words of an old holiday song—

> "Let them cease to teach the dog dog-latin;
> but continue to tell the cat of Catiline."

Professor Ewing, Director of Naval Education, wrote as follows in *The Times* on the 3rd March, 1905—

> "We were approached at Cambridge by a gentleman who wished to found a Professorship of Naval Architecture and endow it liberally, with the fullest equipment for experimental work. Such a Chair would have been an element of strength in the University. It would have been a great national possession. But he withdrew when he learnt that students could not be admitted with the prospect of graduating except under conditions which it is now sought to modify."

Think what naval architecture is to this country, how our food supply, our commerce, and all that makes us an independent nation, is contingent upon our finding the right solution of many problems of naval architecture! Is it a study to be discouraged at Cambridge for the sake of those non-resident Bœotians, who are too groovy to allow other people to learn anything new? Are they afraid of the students of naval architecture describing dead languages as the "barnacles" of education?

I have no doubt that some Athenians studied ancient Egyptian just as a few persons in England study it now, but I cannot find that either Solon, Themistocles, or Socrates ever insisted that the builders and designers of Athenian triremes should be examined as to their knowledge of the cuneiform literature of the Babylonians, or forced to translate into Greek passages from the Egyptian Book of the Dead, before they were allowed to exercise their profession at the Piræus. Although the ancient Greeks did many silly things they were too wise to do that. They do not appear to have studied foreign languages much, but to have been content with their own. Unfortunately, many teachers of dead languages still do what they can to show their contempt of the English language, and insult their mother tongue by calling it the vulgar tongue. They forget that they are living in the reign of Edward VII., and talk as if they were living in the reign of Edward VI. when there was scarcely any English literature. In consequence of this many men who have spent years at public schools are unable to express themselves clearly or correctly in their own language. The results of the Army examinations are a sufficient proof of this.

Greek scholarship has also inflicted other injuries on education. For instance, it has invented a number of scientific terms derived from that language when plain English words would have been more suitable. Students of Greek have thus done their best to make the sciences more of a mystery, and to increase the difficulties connected with their study. In future I hope that they will confine themselves to inventing names for hair-restorers and other patented articles.

As long as attendance at lectures is insisted on at Universities it would seem more reasonable to make a knowledge of shorthand compulsory instead of a knowledge of Greek. Unless a young man has unusual powers of memory he may attend lecture after lecture and remember very little, and if he attempts to write notes in the ordinary manner he runs a great risk of missing subsequent points of importance and of losing the thread of the lecturer's argument. If, however, it were decreed that in seven years time a knowledge of shorthand would be required at Universities, boys would be taught it at schools at an age when memory is at its best and the mind is like an unbaked brick ready to receive any impression. Then they would be able to acquire knowledge at the University with greater rapidity. As, however, shorthand is useful in after life its study would probably be anathema to the professor whose highest ideal in life is to meditate on an ancient Greek tragedy seated in a modern easy chair, *sub tegmine fagi.*

How can we expect to be able to hold our own in the twentieth century in industry, war, or commerce, if we educate all the sons of the well-to-do on theories based on the dreams of ancient tragedians, thereby giving them no time to acquire modern knowledge? The Japanese waste no time on dead languages. How can we hold our own against them in any walk of life if we deliberately waste the time of our youth? Some men are wont to point to the careers of certain statesmen of marked ability as a proof of what their respective colleges can do in the way of practical education. But if they were to take a tour round our Colonies and look at their far more numerous failures it might put them into a more humble frame of mind. We ought to discontinue specialising for the Church and the Bar at an early age, and leave Greek and Latin to be taught later to those intended for those professions. When the Act for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children comes up for revision I hope that clauses will be added to it making the taking of money for teaching Latin to children under the age of nine and Greek to children under the age of twelve offences punishable by a month's imprisonment without the option of a fine. Both Houses of Parliament have of late spent much time on questions connected with the education of the poorer classes. I wish that they would spend one-tenth of the time in dealing with questions connected with secondary and University education.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF HEREFORD: My Lords, with your Lordships' permission I desire, very briefly, to associate myself with the appeal of the Bishop of Birmingham, and like the right rev. Prelate I speak exclusively as an Oxford man. Oxford and Cambridge men are sufficiently conscious of each others infirmities, but we are not always very familiar with each others needs; and therefore I feel that anything I say should be taken as having reference to Oxford alone. The Bishop of Birmingham represents to your Lordships to-night more particularly what we might call the younger Oxford, and I cannot but congratulate Oxford on the enthusiasm for improvement and reform which is to be found there among the younger generation.

I speak as a somewhat older man. I entered the University of Oxford in 1854, when the great Commission had just concluded its labours, and I was the first Fellow elected in my college under the new statutes. I have felt all through my life that I could never be sufficiently grateful to the men who, in Parliament and in the University itself, conferred on the University and the nation the inestimable fruits of the work done by that Commission, such men as Mr. Gladstone and Lord John Russell, Dr. Tait, Mr. Jeune, Mark Pattison, Jowett, and in particular Arthur Stanley and Goldwin Smith. As Mr. Mark Pattison well said, the progress and good influence of Oxford were greater during the succeeding twenty years than they had been during the previous 200 years, and I do not think that anyone who has made a study of Oxford life would for a moment doubt the truth of that statement.

And now to-day, through the Bishop of Birmingham, we ask His Majesty's Government to consider whether the time has not come for a new Commission in view of the vast changes that have come about in almost every department of English life during the last half-century. That period, in Oxford as well as in Cambridge, has been one of very active internal reform and marvellous progress, so that the Oxford of to-day is an entirely different place from the Oxford of sixty years ago. I hope that all who take note of our appeal on this occasion will remember that fact, and will by no means underrate the amount of internal reform which has taken place. It would be quite impossible for any foreign visitor to pass the sort of verdict on the University of Oxford which was passed by a distinguished German visitor sixty years since, who said—

> "Oxford cannot be considered a place of research. We cannot look upon it as a home of scientific education. It is not even distinguished as a home of liberal education, but it has one remarkable and unique distinction—it is a training place for gentlemen——"

and he added, with a touch of malice it may be,

> "especially for Tory gentlemen."

Whatever may have been the case with Oxford then, that is not a verdict which could be passed to-day. We who are approaching His Majesty's Government in the hope of a Commission being issued by and by—not immediately—must be understood to come with a full consciousness of the vast amount of good progressive work which has been done.

But while many reforms have been brought about, yet we feel, as the Bishop of Birmingham has put it, that there are a great many important particulars in which it is not possible for a University to reform itself. Reform from within any institution is very difficult if not impossible, and it is almost always inadequate. With regard to Oxford there are a large number of most far-reaching and important changes which can only be made through legislative action from outside. I will indicate two or three of them by way of selection. There is, first of all, the entrance examination, which really determines a great part of the secondary education of the country. The entrance examination at Oxford simply consists of a rather miserable modicum of arithmetic with a little Euclid or algebra, of a book or two of some classic, the elements of Latin and Greek accidence, and the never-to-be-forgotten attempts at Latin prose. That examination is a survival from early or mediæval times which no one would think of establishing now; and yet the University finds it very difficult, in its relation to the colleges, to alter it. One of the fundamental reforms we might expect from a Royal Commission would be that new subjects of study would be recognised, and Greek would disappear as a compulsory subject. Then, I think the pass examination a bad system, because the student works to attain only a minimum standard of knowledge, and it would be more beneficial if in every University examination students had the opportunity of winning some mark of distinction. To my mind, the passman ought to have no existence in the University. He should be transformed by this offer of distinction.

As to endowments, I wish to associate myself with every word that the Bishop of Birmingham said as to the waste of endowments on scholarships at present. Many of those scholarships go, not to the most deserving, not to those who, if they had the opportunity, would do the greatest service to the nation, but to those who, from the circumstances of their homes, have been provided with the most expensive education, who have been, so to speak, over-trained during the early years in most expensive establishments, and in many cases these men could have gone to the University without the aid of scholarships, which were in most cases intended only for poor and deserving men.

One of the greatest mistakes made by the Commission of 1852 was the throwing open to the unrestricted competition of all the counties of England of endowments and scholarships intended as a stimulus to learning in certain districts. This took away from many able boys the opportunity of obtaining the kind of education which might have made them very valuable servants of the State. Then further a Commission would deal with the whole question of higher education of women, and also, of course, with the powers of convocation and possibly the vexed question of Parliamentary representation.

Probably the most important work the Commission would have to do would deal with the relations to be established between the old Universities and the new city Universities which have sprung up, and, through them, with the new democracy. How are the ancient Universities to be brought into closer touch with the leading elements in the new democracy represented in the great labour movement? A Commission would find some very interesting problems in this connection, and the discussion that would be raised throughout the country would be of the highest value to future education. Mr. Chamberlain has, intentionally or unintentionally, done very great service in effecting two great revolutions in English life. When he raised the flag of tariff reform he split his own Party, but he set the nation thinking, and started flowing a new wave of liberal progress. That was one revolution; the other was the foundation of Birmingham University. Each of them has been directly or indirectly beneficent. By establishing the University of Birmingham as the centre and crown of the life of a great city Mr. Chamberlain destroyed the idea of a federal University, which had prevailed in the Midlands and the North of England, and every great city became ambitious to have its own University—Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, Sheffield, and Bristol. Mr. Chamberlain has done very great service to the nation by creating in English cities this new interest in higher education, and by setting flowing this interest through every grade of the community. He has affected and influenced the life of all in the new democracy—raising them with new hopes, new expectations, new ambitions. That was one of the greatest services lately done to English life.

But these new city Universities are still in their infancy. We have not yet had time to know with any certainty what sort of relationship they ought to bear towards the older Universities. We may have our visions, but we have not yet had sufficient experience. I have a vision of all these city Universities being connected by an open high road of communication, and of students passing from one to the other, following some famous teacher or to study some special subject under the most favourable circumstances, so that we may have an education such as we have never had before. But as yet they are very young, and as I hold that this relationship is by far the most important part of what would be the work of the new Commission, I am not in a very great hurry to have such a Commission. I should be quite content to have it next year or the year after; but I do hope that, for the good of the future education of England, before he leaves his office the Lord President of the Council will take care that this new Commission shall be set on foot to take in hand this most important part of the educational work of the people, for the happiness of the generations to come.

*LORD BURGHCLERE: My Lords, I hope I may be allowed for a few minutes, as a layman and a supporter of His Majesty's Government, to associate myself with those who hope that Ministers will hesitate before advising the Sovereign to appoint the Commission asked for, at any rate at the present moment. I should not have risen at all had it not been for the concluding words of the Bishop of Birmingham. At the commencement of his speech the right rev. Prelate indicated, I thought, that he would be content with the appointment of a Commission some two or three years hence, but at the conclusion of his speech he spoke of its appointment in the near future. I am certain that there is no one on either side of the House who has been at Oxford or Cambridge who is not anxious for any inquiry which would lead to the greater educational efficiency of the two Universities, or would in any way help them in their financial straits; but I hope that if His Majesty's Government consent to recommend this Commission they will not do so for at least two or three years.

I should like to be allowed to say a few words in defence of that class, I mean the passmen, who have been spoken of somewhat disdainfully. I have had amongst my friends some of those who have won the highest honours in the great Universities, but I venture to think that a University composed of senior wranglers and senior classics would not have its due effect upon the life and character of the nation. The right rev. Prelate the Bishop of Birmingham spoke of strenuous work. Strenuous work leads to knowledge, but character alone leads to wisdom; and I venture to think it is in the atmosphere of these ancient Universities that many of our most useful citizens learn what character means. Surely it is amongst those who have not perhaps attained to the highest standard of learning the right rev. Prelate desires, but who bear away from the Universities that impress of character they so often give, that we find those useful citizens who fill voluntarily and with so much efficiency the minor administrative offices of the State. I therefore think with all submission there is something to be said even for the despised class referred to by the right rev. Prelate.

There is another reason why I venture to hope His Majesty's Government will not consent to the immediate appointment of this Commission. Your Lordships well know that the revenues of Oxford and Cambridge have not of late years been absolutely sufficient for their needs. Appeals have been made by the Chancellors of both Universities in order to meet that deficiency by private effort —by the Duke of Devonshire as Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, and by Lord Curzon as Chancellor of the University of Oxford. One subject for inquiry by the Commission will doubtless be how you are further to tax the endowments of the colleges so as to aid the Universities as a whole and the prospect of such an increment of their revenues may well check the generosity of the outside subscriber. In my opinion the financial needs of the Universities cannot be supplied either by further taxing the endowments of the colleges or from subscriptions from private purses alone. They really want to get both. If this Commission is appointed at once the effect may be to stop, or at all events to diminish, the flow from private purses. Private subscriptions should be allowed to come in first. I therefore hope His Majesty's Government will pause before recommending the appointment of this Commission at the present moment, because by doing so they may unconsciously injure the educational prospects of the two Universities.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD: My Lords, I will not detain the House long, but before I held my present office I had the privilege of living for thirty years in Oxford, and I therefore hope I may be allowed to say a few words in this discussion. I should like to confirm what fell from the Bishop of Hereford with regard to the claim that we can make for Oxford, that in the matter of bringing itself up to modern requirements it really has kept pace with the University of Cambridge in the brilliant career which the Bishop of Bristol has described. We have not the finest Chinese library, and I am not certain that it is really necessary, nor have we what sounded in the Bishop of Bristol's speech like a sort of scientific garage. But, speaking generally, great changes have taken place in Oxford, and generous efforts have been made to bring the University as nearly as possible to the level of the advancing requirements of the time. I think there is no real indifference in Oxford in that regard. I have heard complaints made that working in Oxford was like pursuing study in a house that always had workmen about, so ceaselessly active were we in developing this and that modern method of education. I do not think we have been so fast asleep as people sometimes imagine.

I wish to say a word with regard to one special point in the Bishop of Birmingham's speech. He spoke of his great desire that endowments which were originally intended for the benefit of poor scholars should be now so used; and with that desire I associate myself most heartily. But I cannot help thinking that the Bishop of Birmingham has underrated the degree to which that is already secured. He spoke of there being two-fifths of those who now hold scholarships who could go to the University without such assistance. That is 40 per cent. Another estimate which has been made with some care reduces the number to 10 per cent. I am not prepared to insist upon 10 per cent. as being quite accurate, but if 10 per cent. understates the number I think 40 per cent. overstates it. Whatever needs to be done in that regard can be done by the colleges, and I do not think that if the need is clear the colleges will be slow to do it. If it can be shown that there is a considerable number of really necessitous men able to benefit by University education, I do not believe that it would be withheld. The colleges could themselves in certain conditions pass statutes which, receiving the approval of the King in Council and of Parliament, have the force of law, and therefore without any fresh legislation that great and salutary change, if it be needed, can be brought about.

As to the Bishop of Birmingham's indictment against us of idleness, I will not attempt to deny that there is a great deal of pleasure-making in Oxford, and I will not deny that there is a certain amount of idleness. But we must not put that down for blame to the University. We must consider one great source of encouragement towards idleness to which the Bishop of Birmingham himself dramatically pointed. He spoke of the language which you will hear in many homes—language of compassionate regret that the son of the house is called away so seriously from the important avocations of cricket and football by unreasonable claims that he should work. I think that that language is sometimes hurtful, and I think that the feeling which lies behind that language—the exaggerated enthusiasm for athletics—has really a very great deal to do with the idleness of which the Bishop of Birmingham complained. All through, at private school and public school, and at the University, the boy knows that it is a very close thing whether he will be bringing more delight home if he can say that he has got a prize or if he can say that he has got into "the eleven." I think there is very little doubt that "the eleven" would sweep the board; and as long as that is the state of mind in the homes of England you must not wonder that in the public schools or the University there is the same thing. At all events, that the Universities do not generate it I am sure. Then I wish to associate myself with the plea for the passman. There is a certain amount of intellectual Pharisaism in the way that people talk about the passman: and it was with a shudder that I heard from the Bishop of Hereford the bold statement that the passman should be abolished.

THE LORD BISHOP OF HEREFORD: I spoke of the pass examination.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD: I am afraid the passman would come to an end if the examination were abolished. If you speak of waste of time it is not the passman who does all that. The honour man, who might get a first and gets a third, who might learn to think and only learns to talk, who might really get hold of great authors and stays on the surface of them and writes cleverly about them —he is wasting his time, his gifts, his wits, far worse than the industrious passman, who really gets hold of as good an education as he could. I would plead for the passman that he goes out from that complex process of University education very well qualified to do his work in life. Up and down England many of the men who are doing the best public service were passmen. When the Bishop of Birmingham speaks of the great need of developing in a University the study of social science I feel that we might have learned at the University very much more to guide us in regard to many problems than we did. But I feel also that very many men now learn how to think, they learn how to keep their tempers, they learn to work with others, they learn to do justice to other people's convictions; and if you imperil that kind of learning you had better be very sure that you have got something better to put in its place.

With regard to the appointment of a Commission, I do not for a moment deny that changes may be necessary, and I would be most sorry to separate myself from the educational enthusiasm which has been expressed by those who prompt the desire for a Commission. Only I have been anxious for two things—first, that justice should be done to the Universities as they are, and to the men that they now turn out; and, secondly, that a Commission should not be appointed without due weight being given to the enormous expense of time and trouble that will be involved.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: My Lords, I think it cannot be disputed that the subject which was brought before your Lordships' House with so much power by the right rev. Prelate the Bishop of Birmingham is one which comes home to many of us as a subject of the first interest. Very many of us—I should think the majority of us—studied, or otherwise, either at Oxford or at Cambridge, and this discussion brings back to us the days when we too—

"vexed the souls of deans,
And caught the blossom of the flying terms.'

There is no doubt that for some time what may be called University reform has been in the air. That is due to a variety of causes. The fields of study have been widely expanded in the manner so fully described by the Bishop of Bristol. Then there has been the upspringing of the new provincial Universities with all their consequences; and there has within the last few years been impressed upon the public mind the whole question of University extension and the methods by which the endowments of the Universities can in some way be applied for the benefit of those poorer citizens of this country for whom, as has been so truly said, they were originally intended. And of late the matter has been brought to something of a focus by the publication of a series of interesting letters in *The Times*, written by Oxford tutors, which have been republished in pamphlet form under the title of "Oxford and the Nation."

I do not propose, in the few words I have to say, to enter into any of the details of the work as it is now carried on at either of the two great Universities. Still less do I propose to make any comparison between the work of Oxford and Cambridge respectively, or the progress that those Universities have made. As a loyal Cambridge man, I know that comparison could have but one result. On the other hand, the noble Marquess opposite, an equally loyal Oxford man, would no doubt arrive at entirely different conclusions. What I have to do, on behalf of the Government, is simply to answer the question as to whether the Government is prepared to advise His Majesty to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the affairs of the two Universities.

The appointment of a Commission is urged upon various grounds. We are told that it is important to deal with the problems of study, both as regards the nature of the different studies carried on, and what I may call the financial side of the question—such matters as scholarships and prize fellowships. Then, again, it is urged that the relations between each University and its colleges, and between college and college—with special reference, of course, to endowments—demands a close inquiry. We are reminded, too, that it is almost thirty years since the last Commission sat, and that even if the Universities desired to reform themselves from within, yet it would not be possible for them to do so without the intervention of a Royal Commission. And it is further pointed out that the very work of the last Commission has in some cases proved to be of an actually hampering nature, and that the errors into which as human beings the Commissioners in some cases naturally fell could only be set right by legislation founded on the report of a further Commission.

Those are the reasons for which we are told that a Commission ought to be appointed. On the other hand, certain objections have been made, both in the course of the debate and outside. Lord Burghclere dealt with the question of appeals for money. He specially alluded to the requests which have been publicly made by the Chancellors of both Universities for those who have been educated at each respectively to come to their aid. They no doubt bear in mind the fact that if such a movement is to succeed it must be to some extent of a national character, because the old Universities cannot make those appeals to local patriotism which have been responded to so freely in the case of the newer Universities. I have no doubt, also, that they compare the state of things somewhat sadly with what obtains in the United States, where it is estimated that during the last thirty years £48,000,000 sterling have been privately subscribed for the benefit of the Universities of America. And my noble friend argued that, if we were now to accede to the request for the appointment of a Royal Commission, the flow of money which has come in to some extent, and which, it is hoped, will come in to a greater extent, would be, if not stopped altogether, seriously checked.

Then, again, the right rev. Prelate who has just sat down spoke of the delay which would be caused by the appointment of a Royal Commission in carrying on what I may call the ordinary progress of the University, and the state of uncertainty which would arise, hampering the every-day work either of Oxford or Cambridge to a very considerable extent. I have been reminded of a case in which a college at one of the Universities desired to amend its statutes in 1875 and was prevented from doing so on the ground that a Royal Commission was shortly to be appointed, with the result that the statutes were, as a matter of fact, not actually amended until the year 1882, a delay of seven years, when the statutes of the Royal Commission passed through Parliament.

Further, it is urged against the appointment of a Royal Commission that, although it is true, as stated, I think, by the Bishop of Bristol, that there are certain things in the direction of allowing greater flexibility to colleges and Universities which the new Commission might effect by undoing what has been done by the last one, still you cannot have any guarantee that the Royal Commission would undertake that duty, and that it might imitate its predecessor in making very distinct and positive suggestions which would have to be carried out, and some of which might prove, as former ones have proved, to be erroneous and unfortunate. And, again, we have been told that really more time is wanted to watch the effect upon our national life and our education generally of the foundation of the new Universities. It is urged that it is only after some experience of their work that we can decide what place Oxford and Cambridge really ought to take in our national life. Everyone will, I think, agree that we do not wish these Universities to plunge into a competition of science and technology with such Universities as those of Leeds and Birmingham, and consequently we are asked to wait in order to see what the next few years at any rate may bring.

Those are the various opposing views which are set before his Majesty's Government. I may remind the House that the Government, as such, has only had the opportunity of considering this matter at all since the right rev. Prelate placed his notice on the Paper, which, I think, was some ten days ago, and we certainly do feel that the appointment of a Royal Commission, like other important events in life, is one which is not to be undertaken lightly or inadvisedly. We have, as a matter of fact, only what I may call casual evidence of the feeling which actually exists either at Oxford or

Cambridge, such intimations as people have been kind enough to send before this debate began, and we have also learned much from what the various speakers in the course of the discussion itself have said.

But it is important for us, before arriving at a final conclusion, to know what the most thoughtful and the most competent opinion at both Universities really demands, and we also must either inform ourselves or be informed exactly what the Universities cannot do of their own motion and for what purpose legislation would be required on the recommendation of a Commission, and we should also desire to be informed as to whether there does exist at the Universities anything like a deadweight of obstruction against reforms which is of a character which could only be removed by statute. Consequently, therefore, we desire time to consider this matter in the light of the best information which we can receive, and we look with confidence for help and suggestions as to the best methods of proceeding from those of both Universities who are most competent to give it.

In the meantime I am quite confident that this discussion will of itself have done good and have been useful. This is one of the subjects on which, in Carlyle's famous phrase, "we differ only in opinion." Happily, no political questions enter into the discussion. Neither, I am happy to think, do any theological differences arise. It is merely a question of honest differences of opinion as to what is the best way to proceed in order to do what we all wish to be done; and certainly it does seem to me that the best minds of those who are either at the Universities, or who are interested in the Universities cannot possibly be applied to a higher object than that of putting these ancient homes of learning, which many of us so deeply venerate, with all their splendid traditions, to the fullest possible use, and, where necessary, of bringing them into closer conformity with the needs of the country, and with what, in the opinion of those best qualified to judge, is the truest conception of learning as it should exist to-day.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, if I agree, as I do, with the conclusion which has been arrived at by the noble Earl, it is certainly not because I remain unmoved by the speech in which the Bishop of Birmingham introduced this subject to your Lordships this evening. All who had the privilege of listening to that speech will, I think, agree with me when I say that it was one of the most eloquent appeals to which we have ever listened, and a speech which, of itself, is a very notable contribution to the cause of University reform—-a speech of which I would almost say that, if you could take it at its present value, it may do more to advance the cause of University reform than the announcement that a Royal Commission might be appointed, let us say, somewhere about the year 1910, with the prospect that the public would have its report before it somewhere about the year 1915.

This evening's debate raises many important questions, questions with which I certainly shall not attempt to deal at length in the few words I have to say—Do the old Universities need reform? If so, in what direction should we look for such reform? Is a Royal Commission the best mode of bringing about such reform? And, if so, should such a Commission be appointed now or hereafter? With regard to the need for reform, I am quite ready to accept what fell from the Bishop of Birmingham when he told us that immense changes had taken place during recent years in the higher education of this country, and that it was necessary for Oxford and Cambridge to take their proper place in the new order of things. That is freely admitted by all whose opinion is worth having as representatives of the older Universities. Such reforms might have relation to the constitution of the Univeristies, to the relations of the Universities and the colleges, to the widening of the scope of University studies, to the encouragement of research, and to similar matters.

In regard to all these there is no doubt much to be done, but I was very glad when I heard the right rev. Prelate tell us that he had no desire to assimilate the old Universities too closely with the more modern institutions with which we are familiar in other parts of the country. I trust, that, whatever is done the old Universities will be allowed to retain something of that distinctive character which, after all, has rendered them famous throughout the civilised world and that no attempt will be made to place them upon exactly the same footing as those technical and professional Universities which have been brought into existence with such admirable results in other parts of the country.

The only point on which I feel inclined to complain of the right rev. Prelate was when he took the old Universities to task because they did not instil into their students a sufficient appreciation of the duties of citizenship. It is quite true that the old Universities have no special chairs whose duty it is to inculcate the proper functions of a British citizen, but I do think that we have a right to claim that the men who have passed out into the world through the portals of Oxford and Cambridge have carried with them as strong a sense and as high a standard of the duties of citizenship as youths educated in any other institution in the United Kingdom. It would not, I think, be very difficult to point to the cases of those who, all over the world, as well as at home, are, and have been, upholding the honour and reputation of this country and to trace amongst them men who owe whatever qualities and character they possess to the education which they have received as youths at Oxford or Cambridge.

Then I ask the question—If it be admitted that reforms are necessary, is the appointment of a Royal Commission the best mode of obtaining such reform? I agree with the Lord President in thinking that the appointment of a Royal Commission is not a thing to be lightly undertaken, and I should be extremely sorry to see such a Commission precipitately and without the fullest consideration imposed upon a reluctant University. We are often told, and sometimes there is a trace of truth in the statement, that Royal Commissions are appointed when a particularly tough and difficult subject has to be disposed of and when it is not altogether convenient to those concerned to dispose of it or pronounce an opinion on it at the time. Without suggesting that the appointment of a Commission in this case would be merely a means of shelving the difficulty, I do suggest that such an inquiry could scarcely fail to be one of great length, and, while it was proceeding, it would certainly arrest altogether that movement in favour of reform which, I believe, is proceeding at this moment with excellent results in both Universities. There is always this risk, too—that the Royal Commission might issue a Report which would be thoroughly inconclusive, representing the views of a number of different authorities who had arrived at some lame and impotent compromise, of no great use for the guidance of Parliament.

There is some force in the argument that the appointment of a Commission would arrest the progress of reform, because it would be untrue to suggest that nothing is being done to bring about reforms at this moment. At Oxford of late years there has been an extremely liberal expenditure on buildings, many new lectureships have been founded, new courses of study have been introduced, students have been admitted from outside in much greater number, attempts have been made to promote research, and, lastly, I would call attention to the fact that the candidates for local examination have increased to an enormous extent. In 1877 the numbers were 2,300; in 1906 they were no fewer than 16,200. Therefore it would be altogether unjust to Oxford to represent her as though she were a sort of Sleepy Hollow in which the spirit of reform did not in any way prevail. It would be still more unjust to suggest that the general attitude of the University authorities is one of obstruction to the cause of reform.

There is one other matter connected with Oxford which it is not inappropriate to mention. The Chancellorship of the University has lately been assumed by a distinguished statesman, a courageous administrator if ever there was one, and one who is not likely to fail in his duties on account of excessive timidity. He is already engaged in an effort to improve the financial position of the University. Your Lordships are well aware of the great financial difficulties which the Universities have lately encountered. In both Universities a determined effort is being made to appeal to the public for an amount of pecuniary assistance sufficient to place the Universities in a sounder financial position. These appeals have already achieved a considerable amount of success, and I cannot help feeling that the announcement at this moment of the appointment of a Royal Commission might have the effect of drying up the stream of this liberality. Therefore, on the whole I am certainly doubtful whether it would be politic at this moment to encourage the idea that a Royal Commission should be appointed in the near future. I should be myself inclined to rely to a great extent on the desire of the two Universities to introduce reforms of their own accord; nor do I wish to exclude the idea of legislation which might have the effect of facilitating such reforms. Reference has been made to a remarkable letter in *The Times* this morning from a number of gentlemen connected with the University of Oxford, and I observe that in that letter they express the desire not only for a Royal Commission, but also, as an alternative, for legislation which might have the effect of removing any obstacles in the way of the introduction of the kind of changes that they desire. Only one word more. On this occasion, and not for the first time, I deeply regret the absence of the Duke of Devonshire, who had he been here this evening would have spoken to us, not only with the weight of authority which characterises all his speeches, but with the additional weight of authority which belongs to him as Chancellor of one of the two Universities whose affairs we are debating.

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: My Lords, I will not detain your Lordships with any observations in moving the Motion standing in my name. I understand that the noble Lord who represents the Irish Office cannot give the whole of the information asked for, but he is ready to grant a Return containing all the information available. Such being the case, I will content myself by simply moving for the Return.

Moved, that there be laid upon the Table a Return giving—(1) The number and names of the evicted tenants already restored to holdings under the Act of 1903, the date of their eviction, a statement as to whether they were or were not Plan of Campaign tenants, whether they were judicial tenants or not, and the amount of arrears when they were evicted. (2) The number of those cases reported upon in which the applicant was considered suitable, and the number of such cases in the Estate Commissioners heard evidence or acted on information other than that contained in the reports of their inspectors. (3) Of the 1,259 cases mentioned in paragraph 23 of the Estates Commissioners' Report on Evicted Tenants, dated 11th June, 1907, how many of the tenants now in possession of the holding from which the applicants have been evicted have been in possession for five, ten, and twenty years respectively—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

LORD DENMAN: My Lords, I am glad to be able to give the noble Earl some, at all events, of the information for which he asks, or to promise to obtain it for him. With regard to the first paragraph, I can give him all the information down to the words "campaign tenants." When it comes to the question of judicial tenants there would be some difficulty, I understand, in obtaining information. It would entail prolonged research among the fair rent file and prolonged investigation in the Land Commission Court, and even if that investigation were undertaken it might not be conclusive, because judicial rents have been fixed in the names of persons other than those who have been evicted. With regard to the amount of arrears when they were evicted, that also would be a matter of some difficulty, because it would be necessary to communicate with the landlord in each particular case, and this would entail a good deal of correspondence and delay. As to paragraph 2—the number of those cases reported upon in which the applicant was considered suitable, that is given in the table of the special Report of the Estates Commissioners, and since the time they signed that Report there have been some 210 cases. The cases examined numbered 744, to which 210 have to be added. As to the latter part of paragraph 2, I think the noble Earl is under some slight misapprehension with regard to the Estates Commissioners hearing evidence. The Estates Commissioners did not take oral evidence on these matters. I was prepared to go rather into detail as to the manner in which they do obtain their evidence, but I think it would be for the convenience of the House that I should merely say that they act on the regulations of the Lord-Lieutenant supplemented by a memorandum for the guidance of assistant inspectors which has not been laid before Parliament, but which, if noble Lords opposite desire, I will be glad to lay on the Table of the House. Then, with regard to the 1,259 cases mentioned in Paragraph 23 of the Estates Commissioners' Report on Evicted Tenants, the noble Earl asks how many of the tenants now in possession of the holdings from which the applicants had been evicted had been in possession for certain period of years. The Estates Commissioners are unable to furnish that information because they only have the *data* as to when people were evicted. They have not information, or they are not able to obtain it, as to how long the present occupiers have been in occupation of the holdings. I should like to explain that it may possibly take some weeks to obtain the information I have promised to give, and I would only say, in conclusion, that it is not due to secrecy or reticence that we cannot give all the information desired, but because the information is not available, or could not be obtained without involving extra work on the part of the Estates Commissioners.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I am sure the noble Lord realises the great value of this information in its bearing on the Evicted Tenants Bill now on its way through Parliament, and I merely rise to appeal to him to expedite as much as possible the production of this return.

LORD DENMAN: I will communicate with the Estates Commissioners and give as much information as is possible before the Evicted Tenants Bill reaches the House.

The EARL OF DONOUGHMORE thereupon withdrew his Motion and moved it with the limitations indicated by Lord Denman.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Moved, that there be laid before the House a return giving—(1) The number and names of the evicted tenants already restored to holdings under the Act of 1903, the date of their eviction, a statement as to whether they were or were not plan of campaign tenants; (2) The number of those cases reported upon in which the applicant was considered suitable—(*The Earl of Donoughmore*)—agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

House adjourned at quarter past
Seven o'clock, till to-morrow,
half-past ten o'clock

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 24th July, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

North British Railway Bill [Lords] (by Order.) As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Injured Animals Act (1894) Amendment Bill without Amendment; Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, Advertisements Regulation Bill, Sunderland Corporation Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to—Ashton-under-Lyne, Stalybridge, and Dukinfield (District) Waterworks Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Law relating to the capacity of women to be elected and act as members of county or borough councils." [Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) Bill [Lords.]

And also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Aberdeen Corporation." [Aberdeen Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [Lords.]

Aberdeen Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [Lords], read the first time; and ordered, under Section 9 of The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 285.]

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Report by Dr. W. Leslie Mackenzie and Captain A. Foster on a collection of Statistics as to the physical condition of children attending the public schools of the School Board for Glasgow, with relative tables and diagrams [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAY EMPLOYMENT (SAFETY APPLIANCES).

Copies presented, of Reports of the Committee appointed by the Board of Trade to examine and, where necessary, to test appliances designed to diminish danger to men employed in railway service, together with the Appendices thereto [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGES (GREAT BRITAIN) (GRANT IN AID.)

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 23rd of July; Mr. Runciman]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 267.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No. 3868 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Inspection of Balintore Harbour, Ross-shire.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state on what date in April last the harbour at Balintore, Ross-shire, was inspected; is the officer employed attached to the permanent staff of the Board; and, if so, under what title is he designated in the Estimates.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The harbour was inspected this year by order of the Board by one of its officers. It is not usual to lay responsibility publicly upon a permanent official which properly lies with the Board.

Housing of the Board of Agriculture.

MR. ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): To ask the First Commissioner of Works whether, having regard to the important position of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, and the vital bearing of a proper exercise of its powers and functions in relation to those great departments of national trade and industry, he will see that advantage is taken, when the re-adjustment of public departments is made in the opening of the public buildings in Parliament Street, to afford better accommodation to the Board.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt*): I am earnestly considering this subject.

Irish Land—Owners Refusing to Sell.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether there are any owners of land in Ireland who have refused to sell untenanted land, required for the purpose of restoring evicted tenants to holdings, to the Estates Commissioners after being offered a price which the land might be expected to realise if sold in the open market.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that certain owners have refused to sell untenanted land to them for the purpose of restoring evicted tenants. The prices offered by the Commissioners in such cases were estimated in accordance with the provisions of the Act. In all cases the Commissioners offer what they consider to be the value of the land for the purposes entrusted to them by Parliament, and this is ascertained by inspection of the land itself.

Cost of Royal Commission on Irish Department of Agriculture.

MR. GWYNN (Galway): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury what was the cost of the Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Irish Board of Agriculture and Technical Instruction.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The charges paid up to the present amount approximately to £3,040, but the expenditure is not yet complete.

Application of Mr. Joseph Philpott.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have yet considered the application of Mr. Joseph Philpott, Knocknacolon, Kanturk (No. 2986, E.C.); and, if not, whether, in view of the fact that the purchase agreements with his sub-tenants were lodged in August, 1905, and that this gentleman has to continue paying a rent-charge of

£219 yearly to the head landlord in addition to tithe rent-charges, and in view of other exceptional circumstances already made know to them, the Commissioners will consent to take this application out of order and priority and deal with it promptly.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have decided that they cannot deal with Mr. Philpott's estate out of its due order of priority, and they have so informed that gentleman.

Kerry Railway Guarantees.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will give the railways in Kerry, to which the Government contribute annually, a certain guarantee stating the capital, interest, and further period to run in each case, and also the capital, rate of interest, and annual contribution in each case from rates of the county.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The information asked for as regards the guaranteed capital, interest, and amount of the annual contribution paid by the Treasury and county council will be found on page 98, Appendix J., of the Board of Works Annual Report for 1905–6, and is as follows:—

	Capital.	Rate of Interest.	Treasury Contribution per annum.	County Contribution per annum.
	£	Per cent.	£	£
Headford and Kenmare Railway - - - -	60,000	4	1,200	1,200
Killorglin and Valentia Railway - - - -	70,000	4	1,400	1,400

The guarantees are in perpetuity. The loss in working is not made good by the county.

Overcrowded Condition of Forthill Burying Ground.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the overcrowded condition of the Forthill burying ground, in the Galway urban district; and whether he will send a sanitary inspector of the Local Government Board to report on the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Local Government Board have received no complaint in the matter since 1904, when it was reported that there was still plenty of room for interments in the burial ground. The Board, however, will now draw the attention of the urban district council to the allegation of overcrowding which is contained in the Question.

Australian Customs Duties on Goods Imported from the United Kingdon.

MR. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can say what was the aggregate amount of the customs duties levied in Australia on goods imported from the United Kingdom during the last financial year.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) Information has been received from Australia by telegraph to the effect that the customs duties collected on imports into the Commonwealth from the United Kingdom during 1906 probably amounted to £3,750,000.

Reorganisation of the Colonial Audit Branch Staff.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, seeing that two junior and redundant Second Division clerks were retained, contrary to Treasury Minute, in the Colonial Audit Branch of the Exchequer and Audit Department on the recent reorganisation of the latter Department, and that certain Second Division clerks senior to these two were sent back to the Civil Service Commission as being redundant, he will explain the reasons, if any, for this procedure.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) There was no contravention of any Treasury Minute in the selection of the two clerks referred to for employment in the Colonial Audit Branch of the Exchequer and Audit Department.

Marylebone Council Schools—Appointment of Representative Managers.

MR. WHITEHEAD (Essex, S.E.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the recent appointment by the borough council of Marylebone of representative managers, for the three groups of London County Council schools in Marylebone, and to the fact that the council disregarded the nominations under which candidates had been nominated for particular groups of schools, notwithstanding the resolution of the council of 8th June and the agenda issued to borough councillors on 17th June; and whether he proposes to take any steps in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I am aware that the borough council at a recent meeting appointed their representatives on the managers for the three groups of county council schools in the borough. Nominations for the purpose were required to be sent in by a prescribed date, and this was done. I understand that nearly all the nominations were made for particular groups of schools, but that in three cases no group was mentioned, and further, that, while for one group there were eleven nominations to fill eight vacancies, for another there were only eleven nominations for twelve vacancies. As regards the third group, the number of nominations was the same as that of the vacancies. I am informed that at the meeting, after the voting on the first group of nominations, with which were included the three nominations before referred to, the presiding chairman, with the concurrence of the nominators, included the unsuccessful nominations with the nominations for the second group of schools, and that the unsuccessful nominations for this group were included with the nominations for the last group. Moreover, it is stated that the presiding chairman, at the request of one or two of the nominators, before any voting had taken place, allowed the interchange of a few of the nominations from one group to another. I am also informed that the borough council's resolution of the 6th June in no way prescribed the method of appointment at the meeting, or limited the discretion of the presiding chairman in the matter. It is not one which comes within my jurisdiction, and I have no authority to take any action with regard to it.

Value of Rateable Property in Scotland.

MR. MENZIES (Lanarkshire, S.): To ask the Secretary for Scotland what is the sum total of the present rateable property, as per valuation rolls, in all the burghs and counties of Scotland; and what is the sum total of all the assessments levied by local authorities in that kingdom.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I may refer my hon. friend to page ix (Table 3) and page xxiii (Table 19) of the prefatory memorandum to the last issued volume of the Local Taxation (Scotland) Returns, i.e., that for 1904–5, where he will find the information he desires. The 1905–6 volume is in course of preparation.

Desertions from British Cruisers when Visiting America.

MR. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty how many men were lost by desertion during the visit of the four armoured vessels of the first cruiser squadron to American waters; and how long was the squadron in those waters.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The Answer to the first part of the Question is 161, and to the second part 40 days.

Blackpool New Post Office.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): To ask the First Commissioner of Works what progress has been made in the building operations in connection with the new post office at Blackpool, and when the office will be completed.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) The plans are under discussion with the Post-Office. As soon as they are decided, tenders will be invited and the work will commence; but until the contract is made it is not possible to say at what date the office will be completed.

Delay in Payment of Gurkha Police in Eastern Bengal.

SIR SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he has any information to the effect that in one sub-division in Eastern Bengal the Gurkha police had not received their pay for three months, and that the delay in paying them their monthly wages has been caused by some Swadeshi baboos in the employ of the Government who have been deliberately delaying the necessary returns and papers; and whether he will cause inquiry to be made in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I have observed a statement to this effect in a newspaper, but I can scarcely believe that it is correct. I will make inquiry.

Salaries and Emoluments of Staff Officers.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will specify the alterations which have been made during the present financial year, as compared with the standard of 1906–7, in the salaries and emoluments of officers holding staff appointments.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The reply given to a similar Question put by the noble Lord on the 26th June † will apply to the present Question.

Army Clothing Contracts placed in Scotland.

MR. WATT (Glasgow College): To ask the Secretary of State for War what was the value of contracts placed in Scotland for clothing, etc., of the Regular Army and Militia during the last financial year; and what was the corresponding value of contracts placed in England.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The cost of the articles set forth in reply to a Question put by my hon. friend on the 17th instant amounted to £60,783.‡ Information as regards the cost of similar contracts placed in England in 1906–7 would involve considerable labour in preparation, and I hope my hon. friend will not press for it.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Destroyers in the Mediterranean.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.): I beg to ask the Civil Lord of the Admiralty whether it was the intention of the Admiralty to reduce the number of destroyers in the Mediterranean before the recent loss of a destroyer which it is now the declared intention of the Government not to replace; and, if so, whether it is the intention of the Admiralty to make any further reduction in the destroyer strength there.

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. LAMBERT, Devonshire, South Molton): The reply to both parts of the Question is in the negative. It is considered that there is a sufficiency of torpedo craft in the Mediterranean to meet the present conditions.

Naval Barracks.

MR. BEAUCHAMP (Suffolk, Lowestoft): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can give the average number of men in the various naval barracks during the month immediately preceding the formation of the Home Fleet and the number on 31st May, 1907.

MR. LAMBERT: The average number in the naval barracks in November last was over 10,000. The actual numbers on the 31st May, 1907, were 6,017.

Channel Destroyer Flotilla.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, in view of the fact that the fully-commissioned destroyer flotilla was removed from the command of the Commander-in-Chief of the Channel Fleet last January, whether this officer can obtain the services of the fully-commissioned destroyers for such exercises and at such times as he deems desirable.

MR. LAMBERT: The hon. Member is referred to the Answer given to the hon. Member for the Ludlow Division of Shropshire on 15th July.§ The actual transfer of destroyers from the immediate control of the Commander-in-Chief to that of another can only be effected by Admiralty order and at their discretion.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxvi., 1371.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, clxxviii., 679.

§ See (4) *Debates*, clxxviii., 312.

H.M.S. "New Zealand."

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty on what date H.M.S. "New Zealand" parted company with the Channel Fleet; on what date is she to rejoin that fleet; and whether, during any portion of the time, she has been replaced by another battleship.

MR. LAMBERT: The dates are 23rd April and 18th July, the date of sailing after completion of defects. The reply to the last part of the Question is in the negative; the replacement was in the discretion of the Admiralty not considered necessary.

H.M.S. "Cumberland."

MR. HUNT: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he has completed his investigations into the reason why H.M.S. "Cumberland" was not docked after 20th December, 1905, until quite recently; and, if so, whether he can state the result of his inquiry and what was the condition of the ship's bottom when recently docked.

MR. LAMBERT: The "Cumberland" is being converted into a cadets' training ship. It was not considered necessary by the dockyard officials to dock the ship till she was taken in hand for this service. The condition of the bottom was good.

The Coastguard.

MR. MILDMAY (Devonshire, Totnes): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether in a case where a coastguard station is in process of being abolished, the Admiralty will consult the owner before sub-letting the premises for other purposes.

MR. LAMBERT: As regards Great Britain, the general practice is to give the owner or lessor the first option. In the case of Ireland the matter is in the hands not of the Admiralty, but of the Dublin Board of Works.

Battleship Armaments.

MR. GRETTON (Rutland): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the experience of the Russo-Japanese War shows that the 12-inch guns now mounted in His Majesty's battleships will still be ready and efficient for immediate service after fighting a sustained fleet action; and, if not, by what method does the Admiralty propose to replace them.

MR. LAMBERT: The reply is in the affirmative. Guns damaged in action would, of course, be replaced by reserve guns.

Defence of Home Waters.

MR. BELLAIRS: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the Commander-in-Chief of the Channel Fleet is the officer responsible for the defence of Home waters and of this country against invasion; and whether the strength of the Channel Fleet is to be increased in numbers beyond the fourteen battleships, four armoured cruisers, and three unarmoured cruisers to which it was reduced last January.

*MR. H. J. CRAIG (Tynemouth), before the Question was answered, asked did not the Board of Admiralty regret being obliged, under the pressure of Questions placed on the paper by the hon. Member and his friends on the opposite side of the House, of which this was an example, to make public information regarding important details of our naval dispositions which ought not in the national interest to be divulged—["Order."]—and which in the case of all foreign Navies was invariably withheld.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member's Question is in the nature of a speech. The Civil Lord of the Admiralty is quite capable of taking care of himself.

MR. LAMBERT: In reply to the first part of the Question, the hon. Member is referred to the reply to a similar Question given yesterday to the hon. Member for Rutland.† In reply to the second part of the Question, the Admiralty, as has been frequently repeated, are not prepared to indicate in advance the developments they have in view.

MR. BELLAIRS asked whether there would be a statement in regard to the strength of the Channel Fleet next week.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxviii., 1339.

MR. LAMBERT objected that these Questions pressed upon the Admiralty asked for information which if published would be at the disposal of foreign countries.

MR. BELLAIRS asked whether the strength of the Channel Fleet did not appear in the Navy List.

MR. LAMBERT said that if it appeared in the Navy List his hon. friend should be satisfied.

MR. BELLAIRS said that if the statement he asked for was not made on the Navy Estimates he would repeat his Question in debate.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) asked whether, in the interests of the House and the saving of time, it was not desirable to place the full control of all the naval affairs of the country in the hands of the hon. Member for King's Lynn.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S): The position of Lord High Admiral is still vacant.

"King Edward VII.'s" Defective Rudder.

MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether in view of the public interest in the matter, he will publish a Report giving all the facts and correspondence connected with the fraud committed by the Ayrshire Foundry Company on the Admiralty, who the responsible persons were, with their names and addresses, and the reasons why they were not prosecuted.

MR. LAMBERT: All the information in the possession of the Admiralty was placed at the disposal of the Public Accounts Committee by an official fully conversant with the facts. This evidence will be published in the usual course.

MR. LEA: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the defective rudder, fraudulently supplied by the Ayrshire Foundry Company had been built into the battleship "King Edward VII." at the time they were informed by the works manager of the Ayrshire Foundry Company of the fact that it was defective; and, if so, what was the extra cost involved to the public in ripping it out and replacing it with a good one.

MR. LAMBERT: The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. As regards the second part, the only cost to the Crown ultimately involved in replacing the first rudder with a good one, including the cost of the latter, was £48 4s. 8d.

MR. LEA: Why was not this £48 4s. 8d. recovered from the directors?

MR. LAMBERT suggested that the hon. Member should await the publication of the evidence by the Public Accounts Committee.

MR. A. DEWAR (Edinburgh, S.) asked whether this matter had not been investigated by the law officers of the Crown under the late Government.

MR. LAMBERT: That is so, and they came to the conclusion that no prosecution could be instituted.

MR. LEA: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what steps the latter have taken to prevent defective castings supplied by Admiralty contractors being electrically welded on Sundays or holidays as was criminally done in the case of the rudder supplied by the Ayrshire Foundry Company to H.M.S. "King Edward VII."; whether the Admiralty have on their inspecting staff for the passing of contract-supplied castings any practical moulders; and, if not, will he explain why.

MR. LAMBERT: The serious attention of the Admiralty inspectors has been called to the possibility of electrically welding defective castings, and conditions are inserted in all present contracts which will prevent the repetition of such practices. As regards the second and third parts of the Question, I must refer the hon. Member to the full replies which I gave to similar Questions yesterday.†

H.M.S. "Ringdove."

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, and, if so, when, His Majesty's ship "Ringdove," which is at present employed on the coast of Scotland for the protection of fisheries under the Admiral commanding the Coastguard and Reserves, is to be withdrawn from that service; and whether any vessel is to take her place.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxviii., 1337.

Mr. LAMBERT: There is no intention at present of withdrawing the "Ringdove."

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON: Is any vessel at present employed on this service to be withdrawn?

Mr. LAMBERT asked for notice of the Question.

Scottish Coastguard.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether any reduction in the coastguard in Scotland is in contemplation.

Mr. LAMBERT: The reply which I gave yesterday to the hon. Member for the Rye Division of Sussex applies equally to the Coastguard stations in Scotland.†

Smokeless Blank Cartridge for Artillery.

Mr. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if smokeless blank cartridge for artillery is used by both French and German armies for training purposes; and, if so, if he will instruct the authorities of the Arsenal to provide smokeless blank cartridge for our Artillery.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. Buchanan, Perthshire, E.): I understand that smokeless blank ammunition is used by both French and German Artillery. As I have already explained to my hon. friend on 18th July, the Ordnance Committee are carrying out experiments with this object in view, but the provision of a suitable cartridge at a reasonable cost has not yet been arrived at.

Mr. LUPTON: Is there any particular difficulty in England greater than exists in France and Germany of doing this apparently simple piece of work?

Mr. BUCHANAN: I am afraid it is by no means a simple piece of work. The results arrived at in Germany and France differ from each other; and, I believe, they are not nearly so effective in Germany as in France.

British Colonial Shooting Team.

Mr. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that for a number of years past representative shooting teams from Canada, Australia, and other Colonies have visited England, and that the Colonial Governments have made grants in aid of the expenses of the teams representing their respective Colonies; and whether, in view of the above facts, he will make a grant in aid of the expenses of the team representing the mother country which, for the first time, will shortly visit Canada and Australia.

Mr. BUCHANAN: I have nothing to add to the Answer I gave to an exactly similar Question yesterday.‡

Burma Railways.

Mr. LEA: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, with reference to Mr. Brodrick's reply of the 13th June, 1904,§ to the hon. Member for the Strand Division of Westminster, upon what dates was the report of the acting chief engineer for construction, Burma Railways [No. 3605/45/8–1], of the 22nd August, 1900, representing that unsound work was being put into the Gôkteik Bridge, received by the board of directors in London and considered by them; what was the date upon which an inquiry was held into the representations as to bad work, and who were the Burma Railways Company's engineers present thereat, and who was the Government inspector; and is he aware that the acting chief engineer was superseded, by order of the acting agent of the Burma Railways in Rangoon, on the 29th August, 1900, owing to the attitude he (the acting chief engineer) had taken upon the question of the work on the Gôkteik viaduct.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Charles Hobhouse, Bristol, E.): I regret that I have not the information for which the hon. Member asks. In reply to a previous Question on the 21st February, the Secretary of State stated that he had no ground for apprehending that there was any cause for anxiety as to the stability of the Gôkteik Bridge, and this statement has been confirmed by a report subsequently received from the Burma Railways Company. The allegations that have been made as to unsound work in the construction of the bridge have been investigated and have not been confirmed. The bridge is periodically inspected, and the Secretary of State does not propose to make any further inquiry on the subject.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxviii., 1336.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, clxxviii., 1340–41.

§ See (4) *Debates*, cxxxv., 1475.

Indian Rupee Coinage.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India what number of rupees was coined in the last financial year; what is the profit on each rupee at the present price of silver; what is the proportion of fine silver to alloy in the rupee; what is the proportion of fine silver in the quoted ounce of standard silver; and what number of silver dollars was coined at the Indian mints, and what is the weight and fineness of this coin.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: The number of rupees coined in 1906–7, including the recoinage of old rupees, was 254,331,516. Taking the price of silver at 31½d. per standard ounce the net profit on the coinage of a rupee is approximately 4d. The fineness of the rupee is 916·6 per thousand; and that of standard silver is 925 per thousand. No dollars were coined at the Indian mints in 1906–7.

Transvaal Labour Ordinance.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether this Government intend to make any representations to the Transvaal Government with a view to the removal of the restriction under the Labour Ordinance which prevents British subjects from being imported to do unskilled work in the mines of the Rand.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): As the hon. Member is aware, the Labour Ordinance which was enacted by the late Government will be repealed at an early date, and His Majesty's Government do not propose to make representations in the sense suggested; but it must be borne in mind that even pending the expiry of the Ordinance there is nothing to prevent British subjects who do not come within its special definitions from undertaking work in the mines.

Workmen's Compensation in the Transvaal.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that a Workmen's Compensation Bill has been gazetted in the Transvaal which provides for compensation by employers to employees under certain circumstances, the advantages of which, however, are extended to white persons only, thus excluding coloured employees from its benefits; and whether such differentiation constitutes a disability or restriction upon coloured people, such as was contemplated by the Government when making the reservations in the Transvaal Letters Patent.

MR. CHURCHILL: Yes, Sir, I have seen the Bill, and my inclination is to think that it does not fall within the reservation; but the matter is one which must, of course, be determined under legal authority at the appropriate time.

Assault by Natal Planter on a Coolie.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to the recent case of assault upon one Sukhaie, an indentured coolie, by his master, a Natal planter, named John Leask, junior; whether he has read the evidence led at the trial to the effect that the coolie was brutally flogged by his master with a reim, or raw-hide thong, for not obeying his order; that the said coolie was at the time weak and ill with dysentery; that, after his flogging, he was in gaol for seven days on a charge of desertion; that he shortly after died, his death, according to medical evidence, being possibly accelerated by the blows he received; whether he is aware that, although convicted, the punishment of the said John Leask, junior, was a fine of £10; and whether His Majesty's

Government will consider the advisability of approaching the self-governing Colonies with a view to abolishing indentured labour.

Mr. CHURCHILL: My attention has been drawn to a newspaper report of the case in question, and the Secretary of State will communicate with the Colonial Government and with the Secretary of State for India on the subject. The last part of the hon. Member's Question raises an issue too wide to be conveniently discussed in an Answer to a Question.

Mr. Churchill's Vacation Tour.

Sir GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Secretary of State for the Colonies proposes to avail himself of the services of the Under-Secretary for a visit to British East Africa and Uganda; if so, at whose cost such a visit will be undertaken; and whether he will suggest, through the Secretary of State, that the visit should be carried out by a permanent official of the Colonial Office who deals with matters relating to the Protectorate, so that the Colonial Office may have the permanent advantage of an official personally acquainted with the district to be visited.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs): Perhaps the hon. Member will allow me to Answer his Question, as it personally affects my right hon. friend the Under-Secretary. As the hon. Member was informed on Monday, the Secretary of State for the Colonies has expressed a desire that my right hon. friend should, during the autumn, visit the East Africa Protectorate and Uganda; and unless unforeseen circumstances should prevent him my right hon. friend intends to do so. It will be both convenient and useful that he should be accompanied by a permanent official from the Department. The usual practice will be followed of charging the expense of such a mission, which is not likely to be considerable, to public funds, but my right hon. friend's personal expenses for living and transport, other than Government transport, will be defrayed by himself.

*Mr. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) asked if the Under-Secretary would endeavour to include British Central Africa in the visit, the distance from East Africa Protectorate not being very great.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: My fear is that we may never see him back again.

Mr. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): Why not in regard to expenses follow the example of the late Ministry?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Apart from other circumstances, it is the wish of my right hon. friend to pay his personal expenses.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Why not give him a man-of-war?

The Hague Conference.

Mr. KING (Cheshire, Knutsford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can inform the House what instructions have been given to His Majesty's representatives at The Hague on the following points—the bombardment of undefended coast towns by the fleets of belligerents, the seizure and destruction of private property at sea, the publication of loans by belligerent powers in neutral markets, and the obligation of a formal declaration of war.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury; for Sir E. Grey): My right hon. friend cannot make statements about the instructions given to the delegates; nor add to the statements which have been made public by the Conference as to its proceedings.

Company Law in Guernsey.

Mr. H. H. MARKS (Kent, Thanet): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if the *Projet de Loi*, or draft Bill for the amendment of the company law of Guernsey, referred to by him in answer to a Question on the 30th October, 1906,† has yet become law; and, if not, if he can give the House any information with regard to the prospects of legislation on this subject by the authorities of the Island; and if he can state what, if any, is the *ad valorem* capital duty payable on the registration of companies in Guernsey.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxiii., 886.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): The *Projet de Loi* was referred to a Committee of the States of Guernsey, who for various reasons have not yet been able to report; but it is hoped that their labours will soon be concluded. In March, the Board of Trade suggested a conference with representatives of the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man, with the object of seeing whether the the law relating to joint stock companies in those Islands could be made more uniform with that in force in this country, and a meeting was held on the 4th of this month, when the matter was gone into with, I hope, useful results. As regards the last part of the Question, I understand that an *ad valorem* duty of 1s. per cent. on the capital is payable in the case of companies registered in Guernsey.

Welshpool Cemetery Scandal.

MR. OSMOND WILLIAMS (Merionethshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the case of the parish clerk of Welshpool, who disinterred human remains from a consecrated place of burial without the right hon. Gentleman's permission; and what he steps he intends taking in the matter.

MR. REES: Before the right hon. Gentleman answers this Question, may I ask if he has reason to believe that the action that he took in the matter has not satisfied the objections raised in the locality concerned?

*MR. GLADSTONE: I had better answer the Question on the Paper. In accordance with my promise to my right hon. friend the Member for Montgomery Boroughs, who asked me about the case on the 1st of this month, I directed legal proceedings to be instituted against the parish clerk. The case was heard by the magistrates at Welshpool on the 16th, when the accused pleaded guilty to an offence against the 25th Section of the Burials Act, 1857 (20 and 21 Vic. cap. 81) and was fined £1 or in default sentenced to fourteen days imprisonment.

MR. OSMOND WILLIAMS: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman if he will take any steps to arrange who shall be responsible in the future with regard to the churchyard? Is he aware that in this case the clergyman said he was not responsible, and that the clerk alone was responsible? Suppose the clerk dies tomorrow, who is responsible?

*MR. GLADSTONE: I cannot answer such a Question as that.

MR. OSMOND WILLIAMS: Is the vicar not responsible at all?

*MR. GLADSTONE: I cannot answer that.

Hungerford Justices' Clerk.

MR. MORTON (Sutherland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that the chairman of the Hungerford Bench and the county treasurer for Berks had repudiated liability for £55 5s. penalty and costs collected by the late clerk to the Justices, Mr. Hopkins; whether some authority is responsible for this and similar moneys; and, if not, will he take measures to protect these public moneys which are collected in the name of the Crown.

*MR. GLADSTONE: My attention has been called to the matter. The sum mentioned was due from the estate of the late clerk to the Justices, who died insolvent. Neither the Justices, nor the county treasurer, nor any other authority is responsible. I have no power to intervene in the matter, and I am not prepared to propose any change in the law by which the clerk to the Justices is responsible for fines and fees collected by him.

MR. MORTON: But ought not securities to be insisted on in this and other cases? The money has been lost.

*MR. GLADSTONE saw no reason for altering the law because of this case.

Chained Prisoners.

MR. HAZLETON (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will give the figures for the year 1906, showing the number of prisoners in English, Welsh, Scottish, and Irish prisons, respectively, obliged to wear chains or cross irons.

MR. GLADSTONE: The numbers for the year 1906 of prisoners obliged to wear chains or cross irons were: in prisons in England, 15; Wales, 0; Scotland, 0; Ireland, 1.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: What are cross irons?

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): Are we going to take the burglars of Great Britain under our wing?

Wage Statistics.

MR. T. DAVIES (Fulham): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether it is his intention to send out forms to employers in certain trades calling for a return of the number employed, conditions of labour, wages, etc.; if so, in order to make the return more complete, will he consider the desirability of sending out forms bearing distinctive numbers only, retaining in his office a complete register of firms called upon to make a return, with the number attached in case of reference, with a view to removing the objections on the part of many employers to make the return; and will he consider the desirability of following a similar course when collecting returns under the Census of Production Act.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): With regard to the information which is being collected respecting earnings, I am glad to be able to inform my hon. friend that a large proportion of the employers who have been asked to send returns to the Board of Trade have already done so. The employers were all informed that the identity of individual returns would not be disclosed in any way. In making second application to firms which have not as yet supplied returns, the Department is giving them the option of making use of a reference number instead of stating their names and addresses. The Census of Production Act requires the signature of the person filling up the form, but the names will be detached from the forms when received in the Board of Trade so that they will only be known to the officer receiving the returns.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY (Paddington, N.): Will my right hon. friend explain how he proposes to treat the considerable proportion of firms who do not return their wages? How will those firms be treated in working an average of the whole sum paid for wages?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I think we have sufficient information already. It gives a very good idea of the wages paid in all the leading districts and industrial centres in this country. In fact we have returns already which cover over 3,000,000 of workmen, whereas in returns twenty years ago they only covered about 1,500,000.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY: I am sorry to trouble my right hon. friend again. Is it not true that the firms who do not return information are the worst employers and pay the lowest wages?

[No Answer was returned.]

School Building Grants.

MR. GRETTON (Rutland): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if he has received any applications from local education authorities for a share in the sum of £100,000 for erecting new public elementary schools.

I beg also ask the President of the Board of Education when he will lay upon the Table the regulations informing local education authorities of the methods to be adopted for ascertaining the wishes of parents in single-school areas, with a view to providing a second school from National funds.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. LOUGH, Islington, W.): In reply to these Questions, I must refer the hon. Member to the Answers which my right hon. friend gave to the hon. Member for the Ecclesall Division of Sheffield on Monday last.†

Land Tax Commissioners.

MR. GRETTON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if a number of Land Tax Commissioners have recently been appointed; if so, by whom have such appointments been made; and how many have there been.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxviii., 1179.

MR. RUNCIMAN: There have been no appointments of Land Tax Commissioners more recent than those made by the Land Tax Commissioners Act, 1906. The list of Commissioners then appointed was published in the *London Gazette* of 28th December, 1906, and covered some forty pages. No addition can be made to the list, except by Act of Parliament.

The Public Trustee.

MR. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General whether he will state the date of the provisional appointment of Mr. C. J. Stewart to the office of Public Trustee; whether such appointment was verbal or in writing; and, if in writing, whether there is any objection to laying a copy of the same upon the Table of the House, either prior to or concurrently with the rule establishing the office.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir JOHN WALTON, Leeds, S.): The hon. Gentleman is under a misapprehension. Mr. Stewart has received no appointment, provisional or otherwise, but he is being employed in organising the new Department which it will be necessary to create under the Bill. It is intended to appoint him in the month of October. I understand the rules will be laid on the Table before the end of the month.

MR. BOTTOMLEY asked if the hon. and learned Gentleman was aware that Mr. Stewart still retained his position in the brewery with which he was connected.

SIR JOHN WALTON asked for notice.

Scottish Fisheries Protection.

MR. MORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether the Government propose to remove the cruiser from watching the trawlers in the North of Scotland?

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): No, Sir.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: Is any cruiser to be withdrawn from fishery duties?

MR. SINCLAIR: The "Ringdove" is the only vessel employed at present.

MR. MORTON: Did not the right hon. Gentleman give the House to understand yesterday that the vessel was to be withdrawn?

MR. SINCLAIR: I am sorry if I gave an erroneous impression.

Scottish Valuation.

MR. MENZIES (Lanarkshire, S.): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether his Department have any means of ascertaining definitely the sum total of all the feu-duties and long building leases in each of the counties and burghs of Scotland; if not, as such information would be necessary to know the exact effect of the Prime Minister's promise to exempt these from any proposed taxation under the Land Values (Scotland) Bill, whether he proposes to add a clause in that Bill to insert a further column in the new valuation roll (after the column under the new heading, capital land value) in order to obtain the amount of this value, as otherwise the information gained under the proposed new column might be illusory.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. THOMAS SHAW, Hawick Burghs): The first part of the Question is founded on misapprehension. By the Act of 24 and 25 Vict., cap. 83 (1861), County Voters (Scotland) Act, as amended by the Act of 48 Vict., cap. 16 (1885), Registration Amendment (Scotland) Act, all feu duties and ground annuals are in point of fact at present entered in a separate column in the Valuation Roll. The hypothesis upon which the second and argumentative part of the Question is founded is accordingly erroneous, and it is not proposed to insert a further column duplicating formation already on the roll. Any suggestions by my hon. friend arising out of the shape of the roll under the Bill will no doubt be made by him before the Grand Committee, of which he is a member.

Scottish Public Parks.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he is aware that some town councils in Scotland, having purchased parks on behalf of their ratepayers, daily close the whole of these parks to these same ratepayers, except on payment for admission; whether he is aware that councils have not this power; and whether he will introduce legislation to give them such?

Mr. THOMAS SHAW: I am not aware of the facts mentioned, and as I answered to my hon. friend on a similar subject on 18th June last, I shall be glad to have the particulars on which he bases his statement. When these are furnished I shall consider the need or expediency of legislation.

Irish Horse Breeding.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) whether in view of the failure that attended the efforts of his predecessor in the regeneration of the Irish draught horse, he will see that in future proper steps are taken for the attainment of this object, and that practical effect be given to the resolution which the agricultural council have unanimously passed recommending the starting of a stud book for this breed of horse.

The VICE-PRESIDENT of the DEPARTMENT of AGRICULTURE for IRELAND (Mr. T. W. Russell, Tyrone, S.): The measures hitherto taken by the Department with a view to establishing a register for the Irish draught horse were, in their opinion and that of their Advisory Committee on House Breeding, on proper lines. The question was again recently considered by the Department in consultation with their Advisory Committee, and it was decided to renew these measures in the current year. It is hoped that the wider acquaintance of owners with the provisions of the scheme will have the result that animals of the requisite description will be forthcoming for registration this year. Of the 322 mares offered for inspection last year not one, in the opinion of the Department's Inspector, was of the type sought.

Kanturk Guardians and the Newmarket Extra Police Tax.

Mr. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a copy of a resolution passed by the Kanturk Board of Guardians on the 10th instant, again protesting against the extra police tax levied in the Newmarket or northern portion of the union, and stating that as an excuse for the prolongation of this heavy tax on the ratepayers the constabulary authorities allege the necessity of the maintenance of a protection hut on the farm of Owen Daly, and that if possession of this farm, which was purchased by Mr. Daly through the Recorder of Cork East Riding, and the purchase money paid over by him to Mr. Curry, court registrar, nearly two years ago, be handed over to him, any necessity for the maintenance of the hut will be at once removed; whether he will make inquiry as to why possession of the farm is not given to this purchaser without further delay; whether he will state what portion approximately of the free force of police of Cork County is allocated to the Kanturk and Newmarket districts under normal circumstances; and what other extraordinary circumstances (if any) exist to justify the continuance of the extra police tax.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.): I have received the resolution referred to in the Question. I am informed that Mr. Daly is in actual possession of the greater part of the farm which he has purchased, but that he has not yet got a legal assignment of the farm. The matter is at present before the Courts, and the Government have no power to interfere. About one-sixth of the free force of County Cork E. R. is usually stationed in the Kanturk and Newmarket districts. The police authorities inform me that the three extra policemen for whom a charge is made on local authorities are required for the protection of Mr. Daly. There is no other necessity for extra police in the localty.

Mr. FLYNN asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was aware that this man paid £318, the savings of a lifetime, to the registrar who was the representative of the County Court Judge, and the Government having now obtained a verdict against the sureties, would the money be refunded?

Mr. BIRRELL replied that of course it was very unfortunate that the court registrar should disappear with the funds, and measures had been taken to recover the amount from his sureties, but these proceedings occurred in Court and the Government had no control over them. He quite agreed it was a very great hardship.

MR. FLYNN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there was not a single criminal case in the whole district at the last quarter sessions nor at the assize, and that being so, are the constabulary authorities entitled to quarter extra police?

MR. SPEAKER: Notice should be given of that Question.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): Could the right hon. Gentleman say when these police had been transferred from one portion of the county to another, and if they were so transferred why should Kanturk and the other council pay extra for them?

MR. BIRRELL: I must have notice of that; the point upon my mind is that the police are necessary for the protection of Mr. Daly.

MR. FLYNN asked whether the right hon. Gentleman had seen that there was no criminal business at the last session or assize.

MR. BIRRELL replied that his last words were that there was no other necessity for the presence of the police than the protection of Mr. Daly.

MR. O'SHEE asked the right hon. Gentleman to look into the whole question of the allocation of the police force.

Fermoy Relieving Officer.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that one of the relieving officers of the Fermoy district, who was dismissed his office for irregularities committed by him after an inquiry by the Poor Law Board, has since been reinstated; whether he can state the reasons for his dismissal in the first instance; and why he was subsequently reinstated.

MR. BIRRELL: The relieving officer referred to in the Question was not actually dismissed. It is the duty of relieving officers to give allowances of outdoor relief at the houses of the applicants, but in this particular case the relieving officer required some of the poor people to travel long distances in order to receive their allowances from him, and treated them harshly in other ways. The Local Government Board requested the guardians to call for the relieving officer's resignation. The guardians, however, while strongly censuring the officer for his conduct, unanimously requested the Board to withdraw their demand for his retirement on this occasion, and the Board consented to do so, but upon the distinct understanding that he would be at once dismissed if any further dereliction of duty should occur.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): Is it not the fact that the Local Government Board inquiry was brought about at the instigation of the guardians?

MR BIRRELL: Very likely.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: And had this man not been reprimanded on more than two occasions before the inquiry?

MR. BIRRELL: I quite agree that in Ireland, as in other places, it is very difficult to get guardians to act promptly and wisely in these matters. They are very often too kind-hearted, but the Local Government Board cannot always be quarrelling with them on that account. No doubt it would have been better if this man had been dismissed.

J. W. Leahy Estate near Cahirciveen.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is now in a position to say what steps have been taken by the Estates Commissioners to fix the purchase price of the J. W. Leahy estate at Aghatubrid, near Cahirciveen, in view of the fact that more than six months have elapsed since the case was put in their hands by the landlord and the tenants.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have issued to the owner a preliminary estimate of the price which they will be prepared to offer for this estate, and as soon as the owner has shown *prima facie* title they will make a formal offer for purchase.

Irish National School Teachers.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the number of national school teachers at present in second and third grades, respectively; and the number at the maximum salary of third grade who have now completed three years satisfactory service, and who have not yet been promoted to second grade.

MR. BIRRELL: The Commissioners of National Education inform me that on 31st December last there were 2,551 principal teachers in the second grade, and 4,316 in the third grade. The present numbers in these grades cannot be stated with accuracy, as promotions are in course of being made. There are 774 teachers who have completed three years service on the maximum salary of the third grade. The Commissioners cannot yet say how many of these have fulfilled the conditions for promotion, but the cases are being investigated as rapidly as possible.

Irish Industrial Schools.

MR. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that in many industrial schools children are retained against the expressed wish of their parents, who have good homes and are in a position to provide for them comfortably; and what are the reasons for refusing to restore the children of parents in such circumstances.

MR. BIRRELL: I am not aware that the fact is as stated in the Question, and I should be surprised to find that it is so, having regard to the circumstance that in the majority of instances the destitution of the child is a determining factor in the case. Industrial schools were certainly not intended for the children of parents who are in the happy circumstances described by the hon. Member. If any such case as is referred to should be brought to my notice I will have the fullest inquiries made.

MR. SLOAN asked if the right hon. Gentleman would reconsider his decision in regard to three children in the Blackrock School, and would allow their release if he could prove that there was a comfortable home awaiting them.

MR. BIRRELL: I will certainly look into the case, but I may say that in the great majority of cases the poverty of the parents is the dominating factor which leads to the detention of the children in the schools.

MR. SLOAN: The case I refer to was one affecting four children. The right hon. Gentleman released one, but refused to allow the other three to go. I can show him there is a comfortable home awaiting them.

MR. BIRRELL: Well, I will consider the case, but I can give no pledge.

Kilkishen Evicted Tenants.

MR. HALPIN (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will inquire of the Estates Commissioners why Mrs. Margaret Shearin, of Kilkishen, county Clare, has not been reinstated in her holding on the Doonass property; and whether the Estates Commissioners wired to Mr. Fitt, solicitor, Limerick, instructing him not to take further steps in getting Mrs. Shearin to sign the agreement as arranged until he heard from them again.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have taken no steps to secure Mrs. Shearin's reinstatement, because the applicant's late husband was not an evicted tenant, but surrendered the holding in which reinstatement is claimed. The holding has since been bought by the present tenant. It was at one time suggested that Mrs. Shearin should receive an allotment of the untenanted land on the estate, but this was found impracticable, and the Commissioners accordingly telegraphed to Mr. Fitt telling to him take no further steps in the matter.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire of the Commissioners if it is not possible to obtain another holding for this woman in some other neighbourhood?

MR. BIRRELL: It is not for me to interfere with the discretion of the Commissioners.

Irish Education Rules.

MR. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of

Ireland whether he is aware that the new Rule 127 (b) of the Commissioners of National Education is not universally carried out; and if he can state why preference is given as between Roman Catholic and Protestant schools.

MR. BIRRELL: The Commissioners of National Education inform me that Rule 127 (b) is carried out, and that no exception is made in favour of schools under any particular management, whether Protestant or Catholic.

MR. SLOAN: I will give the right hon. Gentleman particulars of one such case.

Irvine Estate Evicted Tenant.

MR. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any representatives of the late John M'Quade, who was formerly evicted from his farm in Drumkirk, on the Irvine estate, near Ederney, county Fermanagh, have made application to the Estates Commissioners for reinstatement on this holding; if so, does he consider the applicant as suitable for, and one that should be provided with, a holding under the Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill; and are the Estates Commissioners prepared to offer reasonable compensation to the present occupier who holds it as a grass farm, with a view to the restoration of the representative of the deceased man M'Quade or some other suitable evicted tenant.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have received from John T. M'Quade an application for reinstatement in the holding formerly occupied by his deceased father. The Commissioners after inquiry have placed the applicant's name upon the list of persons suitable to receive an allotment of land, but they do not propose to take any steps to reinstate him in the evicted farm, which has been occupied by another person under lease for the past twenty-three years.

Cattle Mutilation on the Kenmare Estate.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the police have received information that a valuable three-year-old cow, the property of Mr. Edward Godfrey, of Donemark, the local bailiff on the Kenmare estate, was killed and mutilated while grazing on the lands of Ardnagoshel, belonging to Mr. Hutchins, J.P.; and what steps have been taken to discover the perpetrators.

MR. BIRRELL: The police authorities inform me that the facts are as stated in the Question. The police have used all possible efforts to discover the offender, but so far without success.

Colemanstown Evicted Tenant.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether John McNamara, of Mountshannon, county Clare, has applied to the Estates Commissioners for reinstatement on the farm now held by Patrick M'Auliffe, at Colemanstown; whether the present tenant of this farm has held it for upwards of eleven years in the face of persecution by the United Irish League; whether John McNamara is one of the 2,000 for whom holdings are to be provided under the Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill; and, in the event of Patrick M'Auliffe being compulsorily dispossessed of his holding, whether he will be given compensation for the permanent improvements he has made, and for the loss he has suffered through the instrumentality of the United Irish League.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have received John McNamara's application for reinstatement in a farm which has been occupied by John McAuliffe for the past eleven years. The Commissioners have fully inquired into the case and have decided to take no action upon the application. McNamara is already in possession of a farm of upwards of sixty acres.

Mr. Conor O'Kelly's Arhagh Speech.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether his attention has been called to a speech delivered by the honourable Member for North Mayo, on 7th July, at a meeting of the United Irish League, held at Arhagh, in connection with the refusal of a man named Haire, who is in possession of an evicted farm, to surrender it for the purpose of enabling the former tenant to be reinstated, in which the hon. Member said they must boycott Haire absolutely, rigorously, and completely, and that they must isolate him from his fellows until he surrendered his farm; and what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

MR. BIRRELL: My right hon. friend the Attorney-General for Ireland answered a similar Question on my behalf on the 11th instant. I would refer the hon. Member to the Answer then given.†

Lady Osborne's Nenagh Tenantry.

MR. HOGAN (Tipperary, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say whether the Estates Commissioners received a memorial last January from all the tenants on the estate of Lady Osborne, of Beechwood Park, Nenagh, in the county of Tipperary, several of whom are under £5 rateable value, asking them to request the owner if she would sell the untenanted land on the estate comprising about 300 acres, which is at present let to graziers on the eleven months system, to the Estates Commissioners for distribution amongst the said tenants and several other small holders on the estate and in the district; if so, whether they have taken any action in reference to it; and, further, whether the tenants requested the Estates Commissioners to ask Lady Osborne whether she would sell to them the interest in the tenants' holdings with the object of resale to them.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners received the memorial referred to and communicated with the owner, who informed them that her estate includes no untenanted land except the demesne, which she does not intend to sell. The owner further informed the Commissioners that she had offered terms of sale to her tenants, whose holdings average an area of fifty acres. The majority of the tenants agreed to accept Lady Osborne's terms, but owing to the opposition of a small minority the sale fell through. The Commissioners do not propose to take any action in the matter.

Education Grants.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland to what object he proposes to devote the equivalent grant payable to Ireland in respect of the £100,000 to be voted for the erection of public elementary schools in England and Wales.

MR. BIRRELL: The hon. Member appears to assume that if the sum mentioned in the Question should be voted, a proportionate grant would be made to Ireland in addition to the £65,000 already provided in the Estimates for the building of national schools in Ireland. This is not the case.

MR. T. L. COBBETT: Is Ireland to have no equivalent to that £100,000?

MR. BIRRELL: No, Sir.

Kenmare Estate Evicted Tenants.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the cause of the delay on the part of the Estates Commissioners in giving assistance to Mr. D. O'Shea and Mr. Cornelius O'Sullivan, two tenants who have been reinstated on the Kenmare Estate, county Kerry.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners are negotiating for the purchase of the holding formerly occupied by Daniel O'Shea, but an agreement as to the price has not yet been arrived at. A grant cannot be given to him until terms of purchase have been arranged. The Commissioners have received their inspector's report on Cornelius O'Sullivan's application for a grant, but have not yet come to a decision in the matter.

MR. MURPHY: Will the right hon. Gentleman urge the Commissioners to do something in this case before the summer passes?

MR. BIRRELL: I do not think the Commissioners require to be reminded of their duty. I will remind them, however.

Mr. Ginnell's Speech.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether in view of the wide publicity given by the Press in Westmeath and the West of Ireland to the speech of the hon. Member for North Westmeath lately delivered at Killulagh, in which he advised his audience to obtain possession of the grass farms by driving the cattle off them, and in which he said they had it on the authority of Lord Denman, a member of the Government, that scattering cattle was no crime if they were not houghed, and in view of the added importance which a speech of this character has when made by a Member of Parliament, he will take steps to have the conduct of the hon. Member adjudicated upon by a Court of law.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxviii., 56.

MR. BIRRELL: I informed the hon. Member on Wednesday last that there was no evidence of the speech referred to beyond that afforded by the newspaper report. No proceedings could be taken upon a newspaper report.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: Has the right hon. Gentleman endeavoured to get any evidence of what happened at this meeting?

MR. BIRRELL: The only evidence is a newspaper report, and the Irish Office has had experience of the folly of taking criminal proceedings on a mere newspaper report.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: Has not a police report been asked for?

MR. BIRRELL: I am quite prepared to ask the police what took place, but I do not think we can take criminal proceedings on the recollections of a policeman.

International Disarmament.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Prime Minister if the British delegates to the Peace Conference have given notice of any resolution in favour of international disarmament.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (for Sir EDWARD GREY): My right hon. friend must refer to the Answer given yesterday to the hon. Member for the Ecclesall division of Sheffield on the same point †.

The Ayrshire Foundry Company.

MR. LEA: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, having in view all the facts of the case and that the action of the works manager of the Ayrshire Foundry Company in reporting to the Admiralty that it had been supplied with a defective rudder for the battleship "King Edward VII" had probably saved the country from a naval disaster of a national character, he could see his way to recommend a money grant to this man.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have nothing to add to the Answer given by my right hon. friend the Secretary to the Admiralty to a similar Question on the 17th of this month. ‡

Vagrancy Law.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he can see his way to promise to bring in a Bill next session dealing with the Vagrancy Law.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I cannot give any promise on this subject.

Alleged Sales of Peerages.

MR. LEA: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether his attention has been drawn to the Motions down on the Order Book praying for the appointment of a Select Committee of this House, with full powers to compel testimony and to send for persons, papers, and records, for the purpose of ascertaining whether there is any truth in the charge of the hon. Member for East St. Pancras that honours are bought and sold in this country; and what action he proposes taking.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am not aware that any case has been laid before the House for such an inquiry as is suggested, and until the Motions to which reference is made become operative Motions by being brought forward and supported in this House, no occasion arises for taking them into consideration.

MR. LEA asked if he was to understand that the Motions for inquiry were to be unnoticed on the Order Paper and the country was to be permitted to infer that neither the last nor the present Government dared face any of these Motions.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN did not think this would be inferred.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxviii., 1358.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, clxxviii., 667.

When the Motions came on, the Government would know what evidence could be produced and would judge for themselves.

MR. LEA asked whether the Prime Minister did not consider this one of the gravest matters that could possibly affect the honour of Parliament and that such allegations ought to be investigated.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: That depends on the case that is made. I do not know what evidence the hon. Member has on which he bases his statements. I have no knowledge of the evidence in the matter, and until I know that I cannot tell what weight to attach to the statements of the hon. Member.

MR. LEA: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he would publish an account of the Party funds?

EARL OF CROMER.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, at the Bar, acquainted the House that he had a Message from His Majesty the King, signed with His Majesty's own hand, and he presented the same to the House, and it was read by Mr. Speaker (the Members being uncovered), and is as followeth:—

EDWARD REX.

His Majesty, taking into consideration the eminent services rendered by the Earl of Cromer, O.M., G.C.B., G.C.M.G., K.C.S.I., C.I.E., formerly Agent and Consul-General in Egypt, and being desirous in recognition of such services to confer upon him some signal mark of His favour, recommends to His faithful Commons that He should be enabled to grant Lord Cromer the sum of £50,000.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I beg to move, Sir, that His Majesty's gracious Message be referred to Committee of Supply.

Ordered, "That His Majesty's Most Gracious Message be referred to the Committee of Supply."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman when it is likely that this grant will come up for discussion?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: On Tuesday next, Sir.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to give notice that I will oppose it.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C (in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. George White; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. Beck.

Report to lie upon the Table.

PROHIBITION OF MEDICAL PRACTICE BY COMPANIES BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 284.]

TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES BILL.

Lords' Amendments to be considered upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 286.]

ADVERTISEMENTS REGULATION BILL.

Lords' Amendments to be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 287.]

FINANCE BILL.

As amended, to be printed. [Bill 288.]

LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS BILL.

Lords' Amendments to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 289.]

NEW BILL.

STATE REFORMATORIES BILL.

"To provide for the detention in State Reformatories of young persons convicted of indictable offences, and for purposes incidental thereto," presented by Mr. Secretary Gladstone; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 290.]

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) [EXPENSES].

Resolution reported, "That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys provided by Parliament, of expenses incurred and compensation payable by the Estates Commissioners in relation to land acquired under any Act of the present session, to facilitate the provision of land for certain evicted tenants in Ireland, and for other purposes connected therewith, and to authorise the National Debt Commissioners to make advances to the Land Commission for certain purposes of such Act."

Resolution agreed to.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.) moved to remove from the operation of the clause "land subject to an annuity to the Land Commission." It would be within the recollection of the Committee that on the previous evening the Chief Secretary and the Attorney-General had agreed that some consideration should be given to the case of those new tenants who had contracted with the State and had become owners in fee of their holdings. That, no doubt, was subject to qualification, but there was no reason why that qualification should exist in the present case. As it stood, the Estates Commissioners were to have the power to determine the tenancy of the new tenant where they had acquired the tenant's land. He thought it was an arbitrary distinction on the part of the Government to say that a tenant who had bought under the Land Purchase Act was to be excluded whilst a tenant who had simply signed an agreement which the head of the Land Commissioners decided was a sale was to be rendered liable to the compulsory methods of the Bill. He hoped the Government would see their way not to draw any such arbitrary and illogical conclusion.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.) thought the Amendment was out of order. The question it gave rise to was precisely the same as that which was raised by the hon. Member for West Waterford the previous night.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) said the point the hon. Member for West Waterford wanted an answer to on the previous night had reference to the tenant purchaser, and upon the Amendment before the Committee that day they were simply debating the same question.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Mr. EMMOTT, Oldham) said he had some doubts upon this matter. He had understood that the point just raised by the hon. Member for North Armagh was different from that raised by the hon. Member for West Waterford the previous day, but he had been waiting to see what was the hon. Member's argument.

MR. CLANCY: The hon. Member has explained it to be the same question.

MR. MOORE contended that they were now dealing with a different state of affairs at a different stage of the Bill. There was no reason why different considerations should not apply at different stages.

MR. T. M. HEALY: What is the difference between a tenant purchaser and a person holding an annuity subject to the Land Commission?

MR. MOORE said that at present he wanted to know the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown as to whether or not this arbitrary distinction was to be carried into the section. He thought he was entitled to ask about the matter.

*THE CHAIRMAN: If the Amendment is to the same effect as the Amendment which was decided last night, then it cannot be moved.

MR. MOORE said it was not to the same effect. The question they discussed last night was whether or not new tenants were to be included with tenant purchasers. As he understood it, the

Government said that where a tenant had ceased to be a tenant and had become a purchaser by vesting order he was to be exempt, but they gave no undertaking with regard to the tenant becoming a purchaser by signing an agreement. He wished to know what course the Government were going to take in the latter case.

MR. CLANCY: Is there any Question before the House, Mr. Chairman?

*THE CHAIRMAN: If we adopt this Amendment we shall be adopting, as I now am informed, something which we decided not to adopt last night, and therefore it is not in order.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) said the first part of the question which they were discussing last night was distinctly replied to by the Chief Secretary. With regard to the second part, however, viz., the case of people signing agreements but not having a vesting order, the Chief Secretary said that the Government would give the matter consideration at a later stage of the Bill.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That does not affect the point we are on now. The Amendment is not in order, and therefore we cannot go on with it.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said he wished to move an Amendment providing that all persons interested in the land should receive the notice mentioned in the section. In the clause as it stood at the present time it did not seem to be an obligation on the Estates Commissioners to give any notice to any one except the new tenant. He could not see that the right hon. Gentleman would have any objection to embodying his Amendment in the clause. It was only fair that all persons interested should receive full notice under the Bill. There might be a considerable number of persons having an interest in the land beside the person actually in occupation.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 28, after the word 'tenant' to insert the words 'and all persons interested.'"—(*Mr. Charles Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange) said he could not accept the Amendment. He did not think the hon. Member realised what it proposed to do. This notice was in the nature of a notice to quit. Special power was given to the Estates Commissioners to exercise their rights as landlords and determine the tenancy in exactly the same way as the former landlord would do. The Estates Commissioners took the place of the landlord and served the notice to quit, as provided by the section, upon the tenant alone. The Commissioners had no power to find out the various persons interested in the holding. There might be people who had charges and mortgages upon the land, but the tenant was the only man paying the rent and, therefore, he was the person who would be served. The hon. Member would see that a subsection of the same clause provided that where a new tenant was put in possession of a parcel of land in lieu of an old tenancy an order would be made to transmit all charges and liabilities from the old tenancy to the new; therefore, no one could be injured by the transfer, and there would be no need to serve the notice upon a number of persons.

MR. MOORE regretted that the right hon. and learned Gentleman could not see his way to accept the Amendment. It seemed to him a perfectly reasonable one, and the principle it embodied had already been adopted in the Land Act. It was undoubtedly a case in which the mortgagees and others interested would have their security substituted for another. They must recollect that they were not dealing with a plot of land for labourers' cottages, but with land which might be described as an "estate." It was the first step in the sweeping away of an old security, and yet the people who were interested were not to be consulted. It was conceivable that the tenant might be a bogus tenant who had no beneficial interest in the holding. All his interest might be vested in his creditors, and yet the tenant was to have the entire control of the negotiations with the Estates Commissioners. If they were not to have public inquiries which by their very publicity were a safeguard, the least the Government could do was to secure that the people who were interested in the transaction should have an opportunity of stating their case before the Estates Commissioners. Not only the tenant in name, but the people who were tenants in fact, should have the opportunity of knowing when the first step was to be taken to set in motion the whole compulsory machinery which would terminate the tenancy in which they had invested their money. For this reason he supported the Amendment.

MR. T. M. HEALY said the hon. Member who had just sat down had let the cat out of the bag when he described these tenants, upon whom the Opposition had wasted such gallons of salt tears, as "bogus tenants" and men who had not a shilling of their own.

MR. MOORE: I said there may be cases of the sort.

MR. T. M. HEALY, continuing, said the hon. Member had described them as "bogus tenants," and that was exactly what he (Mr. Healy) and his friends had been contending all along. He thought the hon. Member had rendered a public service to his country. As to the bogus tenant, he had a knack of disappearing, and he would suggest that service should be by registered letter. He thought it was very necessary in the case of bogus tenants to prevent their hiding, or making away with themselves temporarily, that personal service should not be necessary. He suggested that the right hon. Gentleman before the Report stage should consider whether, as in the case of an ordinary tenant, or ejectment, it would be quite enough that the bogus tenant should be served by registered letter.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL (Dublin University) thought it was rather poor advocacy on the part of the hon. and learned Gentleman——

MR. T. M. HEALY: It is not advocacy; it is debate.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said that that did not make it any fairer—it was rather poor debate to attribute to his hon. and learned friend a statement he had never made. His hon. friend had never said that these new tenants were bogus tenants, but he had referred to cases in which the tenant was not really the person interested in the holding. The hon. Gentleman was very anxious that not a single individual should be injured by the operation of this Bill, and if there was a single case in which the new tenant had incurred an obligation or liability to other people, either under a deed of settlement or a mortgage security, it was essential that the persons entitled under the security should have an opportunity of being heard. He thought the words suggested by his hon. and learned friend were a little too wide, and he would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman the words, "any person interested under a registered encumbrance." All they would have to do would be to search the register, which would certainly not add anything to the expense. Supposing one of these tenants had a marriage settlement: the trustee of the settlement might be the father of the tenant's wife, and might live beside the holding. If this new tenant were transferred to another county, surely the trustee of the settlement or the mortgage creditor was entitled to have a voice as to the place to which the security was to be transferred, or as to what security was to be taken in exchange for the one he had got. That was ordinary justice conceded to every owner of land, purchaser or vendor, in Ireland. He could not understand why any difficulty was raised in this case merely because the tenant happened to be one of those objectionable persons known to hon. Members below the gangway as new tenants.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG, said he would like to point out to the right hon. Gentleman that the principle of the Amendment was already admitted in Subsection (5) of the preceding clause—

> "The Estates Commissioners shall, upon making such offer, give notice in the prescribed manner to all persons known or believed by them to be interested in the land of their intention to acquire the same at a fixed price, etc."

It seemed to him that if they carried the principle out in that part of the Bill they could equally well do it in Clause 3. If it could be done in one part of the Bill, he could not see what extra difficulty there would be in doing it in that part to which this Amendment applied.

MR. T. M. HEALY suggested the adoption of the words, "in such manner as they may prescribe," which would meet the entire case referred to by the right hon. and learned Member for Dublin University.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said he did not see why they should circumscribe the proposal by the insertion of such words. What they wanted was that every person interested in the land to be acquired should receive due notice of the fact that the tenant was to leave the farm within six months or whatever the period might be.

MR. CLANCY said that any Amendment in this direction would place the Commission, in its capacity of landlord, in a different position from any other landlord in the country.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: It is done already.

MR. CLANCY said the hon. Member did not know what he was talking about. The landlord at present could evict a tenant by simply serving upon him notice to quit, and all those interested in charges or encumbrances would have to look after themselves; but in the case of this new tenant they wanted all sorts of new-fangled regulations.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said the person interested in the security should have some say in the transfer of that security, and he thought the words suggested by the hon. and learned Member for Louth might be accepted, with the addition of other words, making the whole read, "In such a manner as they shall prescribe to all other persons interested."

MR. T. M. HEALY: I did not make that suggestion at all.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said he would at least ask the right hon. Gentleman to accept his original proposal.

MR. CHERRY said the hon. Member for South Antrim had not withdrawn his Amendment, which was still before the Committee. As to the point put by the hon. and learned Member for Louth, under the terms of the section notice could be served in the same way as a notice to quit, which could be either personally served or sent by letter, and he did not think there had ever been any great difficulty in serving a notice to quit. It would also be in the power of the Estates Commissioners, under the 22nd Section of the Act of 1903, which was incorporated in the Bill, to make rules dealing with the mode of service. He was much obliged to the hon. and learned Gentleman for his suggestion on the point, and between now and the Report stage he would consider whether it was necessary to make any alteration in the Bill. As regarded the Amendment before the Committee, the hon. Member adhered to its words and refused to accept any alternative suggested.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said he had not refused, and he would be very glad to accept the words, "In such a manner as they shall prescribe to all other persons interested."

MR. CHERRY said he thought the simple words of the section best provided for serving notice on the new tenant. That was what the landlord had to do now, and it was what the Commissioners could do in their capacity of landlord.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) asked whether, if he had a mortgage on a certain piece of land in Ireland from which A, the tenant, was turned out and put into another place, he would have no chance of saying whether he would or would not accept the new security. Was that really so? Was he to understand that the right hon. Gentleman, as a lawyer acting for one of his clients, who was a mortgagee, would be perfectly willing to accept some other property altogether, without having any voice in the change of security?

MR. BIRRELL: I do not know whether the hon. Gentleman has ever served a notice to quit upon a tenant. If so, did he consider himself bound to serve notice on the mortgagee as well as on the tenant?

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY said this was a case in which compulsion was being exercised; the other was a voluntary arrangement. His own experience as to serving notices to quit was peculiarly limited, and he hoped it would long continue to be so. They were here dealing with a change of security compulsorily effected, and all they asked was that notice should be given to the person the validity of whose security might be affected.

MR. MOORE said this was not a mere question of determining the interest in the tenancy. The mortgagee might wake up some morning and find that his mortgage had been transferred to land in another county.

MR. T. M. HEALY said this provision applied only where the Estates Commissioners had acquired tenanted land. In those circumstances how did the question of the mortgage arise?

MR. MOORE said it applied to the land they had acquired subject to a tenancy. What happened was that the mortgagee's interest was taken from him and transferred to what had been stated to be a better security, and therefore he had a right to say whether it was a better or a worse security. Why should the mortgagee not have his choice as to whether his security should be transferred or not? An analogy had been drawn between this and the service of a writ of judgment. There was an express rule in the rules of the Court that every person in occupation of the premises should be served with notice, and before judgment could be obtained similar notice had to be served upon every person who was in occupation of any portion of the evicted premises. He could not see why the Estates Commissioners should have any difficulty in serving notices on the people they believed to be interested in the holding.

MR. T. M. HEALY submitted that this discussion was out of order. Subsection (5) of Clause 2 provided that—

> "The Estates Commissioners shall, upon making such offer, give notice in the prescribed manner to all persons known or believed by them to be interested in the land of their intention to acquire the same at the aforesaid price."

Therefore they would have actually acquired the land, given notice to all the persons interested, and they would have got everything except mere possession. They were only dealing now with the mere acquiring of what was legally the property of the Estates Commissioners.

*THE CHAIRMAN: It is very difficult for a layman like myself to grasp with these legal questions arising on the complicated Irish Land Acts. As I understand the hon. and learned Member for North Armagh, he contends that after the acquisition of the landlord's interest under Clause 2, there is still left the question of the tenant's interest. That being his argument, it is a question of merits, and I think I ought not to deal with it as a matter of order.

MR. CHERRY said that in this matter they were following precedent under the Lands Clauses Act. Under all Acts where compulsory powers were taken notice was required to be given, not only to the actual tenant, but to all persons interested in the tenancy. If the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Shropshire had to serve notice-to-quit upon a tenant, it would not be necessary to serve notice upon every person interested. The law was that if they served notice on the tenant that was sufficient to determine the tenancy, and they followed that rule. The difficulties of the Estates Commissioners under this Amendment would be insuperable, for they would have to undertake that all the interests created in any of these holdings by the new tenants should be served with personal notice, and that would be impossible.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said that the man might receive compensation before the person who had a charge or claim on the tenancy could do anything, and he might get off to Australia or America without his mortgagee or the person in charge of his farm having a chance of receiving a single penny. Surely it was not the intention of the Government to leave the persons who had advanced money on a farm open to such a risk as that. Under this Act a good many of the new tenants would elect to take compensation and therefore they were open to that very serious danger.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said that if they were going to transfer the new tenant to a new home which was to be as good as his old one his mortgage would be secured, but what was to happen if the new tenant elected to take compensation? Was the compensation going to be paid without any inquiry as to whether it ought to be paid to the tenant or to some person who had a charge upon the holding? He thought the Estates Commissioners should make certain that they were paying the money to the right person.

MR. CHERRY said the subject had been considered most carefully, and if the right hon. Gentleman would read the third sub-clause he would see that his point was amply provided for. Under the Act of 1881 when a landlord exercised this right he was bound to pay full compensation to the tenant. If there was any doubt as to who should receive the compensation it was lodged in the Court and the Land Commission determined the matter. Precisely similar results would follow in the case of a holding where a new tenant elected not to take an alternative holding.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said the right hon. Gentleman was mistaken. The section referred to by the Attorney-General had been incorporated for the purpose of awarding the compensation and not for paying it. The Estates Commissioners would have no power to bring to their aid Section 1 of the Act of 1881 which was not incorporated. The only section incorporated was Section 5. If the right hon. Gentleman would insert words showing that his intention was to incorporate the machinery of the Act of 1881 for paying over the compensation as well as awarding it the point would be met.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 62; Noes, 274. (Division List No. 309.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn Sir Alex. F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Askley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. HnG. (Winchester)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Chamberlain, RtHn. J. A. (Worc)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birming'm
Courthope, G. Loyd
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gretton, John
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Ed'ds)
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Charles Craig and Mr. T. L. Corbett.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H (Essex, Romf'rd)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine

Mr. Charles Craig.

Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brooke, Stopford
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C.H.(Sussex, E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W.H.(St.Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C
Essex, R. W.
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Field, William
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F
Fullerton, Hugh
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Grayson, Albert Victor
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W. Bateman(Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jones, William(Carnarvonsh're)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
MacLean, Donald
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah(Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles(Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson, Charles N.(Doncaster
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal(Tipperary Mid.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon, N)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Perks, Robert William
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C.E.(Edinburgh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E.(Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton under Lyne)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T.(Hawick, B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thorne, William

Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Wason Rt. Hn E. (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG moved an Amendment to provide that twelve instead of six months notice to quit should be given by the Estates Commissioners in cases where new tenants were to be dispossessed of their holdings in order to reinstate evicted tenants. He said the section as it stood did not state that the notice was to run from any particular day of the year. The Estates Commissioners could give notice on any day of any month, and it was obvious to any person who had any knowledge whatever of agricultural operations that it would be highly inconvenient and cause considerable pecuniary loss if a tenant received notice to quit at the wrong period of the year. The ordinary dates were 1st May and 1st November, and he did not suppose there would be quite so much objection if it was known that notice would be given on one of those dates. It would be unfair to ask a farmer to give up his holding, say, in the middle of July or August. The date on which a farmer was to give up his holding should be carefully considered in reference to the operations on the particular class of farm he occupied. On the other hand if twelve months notice was given the occupier would have ample time to make arrangements for quitting the farm at the end of the period.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 30, to leave out the word 'six,' and insert the word 'twelve.'"—(*Mr. Charles Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'six' stand part of the clause."

MR. BIRRELL said he had endeavoured as far as possible to follow the precedents to be found in previous land legislation for Ireland. In the Congested Districts Act of 1901 provision was made for six months notice, and he was not aware that any evil consequences had followed. Under previous legislation six months notice had been found to be ample time in Ireland, and certainly it was ample time in England. By doubling the time they would only postpone the object they had in view.

MR. MOORE said the statement of the right hon. Gentleman had not a real bearing on the point raised by the Amendment. In the case of the congested districts the need was urgent, and the legislation went through the House practically unopposed. This Bill had been brought in to settle quite a different problem in regard to which there had been a good deal of feeling. There was not the same ground for opposition to the congested districts legislation, and, therefore, it was not a fair analogy to compare it with this contentious measure. The ordinary tenant in Ireland was entitled to twelve months notice. That was in the Act of 1877, but under this hostile Bill the existing tenant was to be forced to quit in six months. There was no analogy whatever between this Bill and the 5th Section of the Act of 1881 which applied to compensation and pre-emption. There the tenant went out voluntarily and had made all his plans and arrangements. The time of year when the tenant was preparing the ground for crops was that between November and May; and, therefore, if he was transferred under the Bill as it stood to the new farm in May, he would not have time to perform tillage operations and would therefore lose the year's crops. A tenant's labour was his capital, and he could not be expected to labour on his farm from November to May when he knew he would have to leave it and would not reap the result of his work. He maintained that six months notice was too short. He assumed that they were going to give the tenant notice on gale day. He agreed with what his hon. friend had said, that this Bill ought to be worked by gale days and as part of the land code. Surely it would be a reasonable thing to make the notice run for twelve months from the gale day next after the service of the notice.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY said that the right hon. Gentleman was unfortunate in his references to English land laws and customs. Under the Agricultural Holdings Acts there was twelve months notice to quit from a particular day. Therefore the right hon. Gentleman was incorrect again. He would suggest that the right hon. Gentleman should make it worth his while to go across the floor and sit beside him in order to supply him with information on English land law.

MR. MOORE asked whether, if this Amendment were voted upon, it would be open to him to move the next Amendment standing in his name, to leave out "six months service thereof" and insert "twelve months from the gale day next after the service of such notice."

*THE CHAIRMAN said that, as a point of order, the hon. Member would be entitled to strike out from the word "months" and insert "from the gale day next after the service of such notice." But the hon. Member could not discuss it now if he meant to move it later.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said he was at a loss to understand why the right hon. Gentleman was so anxious deliberately to draw an analogy from a statute which was a hardship to the tenant, and had overlooked various statutes both in Ireland and England under which the tenant was entitled to twelve months notice to quit. He would not personally object to six months if the right hon. Gentleman would give him an assurance that the tenant would get compensation for loss sustained if he had to leave his crops on the ground behind him or was compelled to dispose of them or his chattels and stock by forced sale. Of course, where a tenant quitted his holding voluntarily and the landlord pre-empted, the notice was six months, but that was a different thing. In the cases he had mentioned it was only justice that the tenant should receive twelve months notice to quit, which was the case with every other tenant in Ireland by the operation of the ordinary law.

MR. T. M. HEALY said that the right hon. and learned Member for Dublin University had complained of the analogy drawn by the Chief Secretary. That analogy was taken from the Lands Clauses Act under which, when the money was lodged in Court, the purchaser was entitled to get possession in a period of six months. In dealing with cases of compulsion why not follow the procedure of compulsion? He was inclined to think that six months was too long.

MR. CHERRY stated that in reality the tenant would have much more than six months notice, because he would know from the moment that the Estates Commissioners opened negotiations that the land was to be acquired for particular purposes. He would, therefore, know long before the notice was served what was to be done. Moreover, the Estates Commissioners were bound to offer alternative farms so that there would be no interference. The tenant would go out of one farm into another. The Estates Commissioners, of course, were not fools, and they would undoubtedly arrange that the transference should take place at the most convenient time of the year. At the present time it was the usual practice that transferences should take place towards the end of the year when the grazing was all over and the harvest had all been got in. It was not to be supposed that the Estates Commissioners, as some hon. Members seemed to suggest, would seek to irritate and annoy everybody as much as possible. They would see that the notice was served at a reasonable time. A long notice was not really required. The hon. Gentleman said, "Why not fix the notice to quit as running from the next gale day?" For the very good reason that the Estates Commissioners would have no power; the gale days were an arrangement between the landlord and his tenants; and in many cases there was no fixed gale day. As to compensation, as he understood the law, the Land Act of 1881 gave the fullest compensation for every possible inconvenience to which the tenant was put under that Act. Assuming that a tenant would not take an alternative farm, but desired to go out of possession finally, the Bill provided that he should have the compensation given under the Act of 1881. That Act, he understood, gave the fullest compensation to tenants, for it gave them the full market value of the holding which would undoubtedly cover crops, stock, and chattels.

MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.) pointed out that if notice was given that the farm was required by the 1st May, the diligent farmer's crops would all be in the ground at that period and it would be a most intricate and complicated matter for any Estates Commissioner or assessor to ascertain the compensation to be paid to a farmer under such circumstances. He agreed that it was not probable that the Estates Commissioners would serve a notice which would take effect on the 1st May, and he assumed they would serve a notice which would take effect on the 1st November, at which time most changes in agricultural tenancies took place; but he thought that some alteration should nevertheless be made in the provision in regard to notice. If the first day of May was a possible day for these new tenants to be dispossessed, he thought it possible some hardship might arise, because no farmer doing his work properly would enter upon the performance of the ordinary routine work of a farm if it was possible that he might be dispossessed on the 1st of May in any year.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool), alluding to the fact that the Attorney-General for Ireland had said that the Amendment of his hon. friend was not necessary because the new tenant would not want more than six months notice as the Estates Commissioners were buying land for him somewhere else, pointed out that there was no possible means under the Bill by which the tenant could ascertain where the land to be acquired for him was situated. How could a tenant in the south of Ireland possibly know that the Commissioners were acquiring land for him in the north of Ireland?

Mr. Cherry.

MR. CHERRY observed that what he had said was that the tenant would know that the landlord's interests were being acquired in regard to the farm he occupied, and he would also know that land was being secured for him elsewhere before the formal steps were taken.

MR. ASHLEY said he did not see what that had to do with the matter. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to think that leaving one farm for another was like a man in an hotel going up from the first floor to the second. But it was not so easy for a man to leave a farm as the right hon. Gentleman seemed to think. He did not think that the Estates Commissioners would intentionally inflict injustice, but surely the Committee ought to make such injustice impossible.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) said that on the first blush the argument of the Attorney-General for Ireland seemed to be a reasonable one, because the new tenant would under the Bill be put into another farm; but looking a little further into it he contended that the argument would not hold water at all. A parcel of land might be offered to the tenant which was not suitable for him at all. The tenant might say, "I think the land which you offer to me is not at all equivalent in value to my farm, and therefore I do not think it will suit me to take it." In those circumstances six months was not a sufficient time in which to look for another farm. This unfortunate man might wait for six months, and the Estates Commissioners might not offer him a new farm until the expiration of that period, and then he would have no notice at all. How in that case was he to make arrangements for the transfer of his stock and farming implements? Moreover, the Commissioners might say, "The farm we offer you you say is not the sort of farm you want. But we have offered you the farm and if you do not like it out you go." The right hon. Gentleman had said they might rely upon the Commissioners not to turn a man out at the last minute until he had got his crops in. Might he point out that when all the crops had been got in was a bad time for the new man to come in and a bad time for the old tenant to go out? The right hon. Gentleman had said that the Commissioners were not going to make themselves unpopular by doing anything unreasonable, but that was the sort of argument with which they had been met on every Amendment. Every argument they had advanced had been met with the reply "Trust the Commissioners." If that was a good reply why have this Bill at all? Why not pass a measure simply giving the Commissioners full power to deal with all these questions according to their discretion?

*THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that the hon. Baronet was allowing himself great latitude; he could not discuss the Bill upon a particular Amendment.

SIR F. BANBURY said he was dealing with the argument of the Attorney-General for Ireland who said "Trust the Commissioners," and he was entitled to say that that recommendation was one which no sane House of Commons would adopt. He did not, however, want to pursue the matter further, except to say that they should have in this clause, as in every other, directions laid down to guide the Commissioners. What happened ought not to depend upon what might be after all the fanciful dictates of the Estates Commissioners. In England, which was supposed to be the home of the wicked landlord who did everything that was wrong while the tenants did everything that was right, twelve months notice was given, and, what was of more importance, that notice was usually received at a fixed date.

*THE CHAIRMAN said he must remind the hon. Baronet that the period of notice which was given in England had already been referred to in the debate many times.

SIR F. BANBURY said he was not aware of that, but it was a very strong precedent and he thought was well worth mentioning. He did not know that it had been mentioned before and the Attorney-General did not reply to it. It was, however, a subject which was worthy of consideration.

MR. CHERRY: I did reply to it.

SIR F. BANBURY said that he did not notice that the right hon. Gentleman had done so, but he would not further pursue the topic. He had much pleasure in supporting the Amendment of his hon. friend, and if it was pressed to a division he should vote for it.

MR. LAMBTON (Durham, S.E.) remarked that a good deal was said about the English landlords and about their turning people out of hearth and home in a cruel manner, but he challenged the right hon. Gentleman to point out cases in which people were turned out at six months notice.

MR. CHERRY: We have to provide him with another farm.

MR. LAMBTON said that that was not the same thing. If a man was turned out of a farm in England he could get another farm to his liking in any other part of the country. In this case, however, it did not seem to matter whether or not he liked the farm which was offered him. He challenged the right hon. Gentleman to make this Bill appear analogous to the English practice.

MR. T. M. HEALY did not think hon. Members knew what was going on in England in the way of turning men out of their holdings and their homes. They were frequently turned out of their homes under the Lands Clauses Acts with only six months notice. He might also ask what notice had been given to tenants removed to make room for important Government buildings such as those in Parliament Street? None whatever. The late Government served notices on all the tenants of the island of Berehaven and fixed as arbitrators two local resident magistrates. When those gentlemen had the courage to say they did not believe they had jurisdiction, the law officers of the Crown took them by *certiorari* before the King's Bench. That was the action of a Conservative Government. This Government said to the new tenant "If you need it we will give you a salubrious farm in another district, where you will require no police protection, and where you will be in the promised land of the Orangeman."

Mr. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.) said the last speech was no doubt of a very humorous character, but this was a very serious matter, as there was something tragic and pathetic about new tenants, many of whom had been on their holdings twenty-four or twenty-five years, being turned out neck and crop and told to go elsewhere without due notice. After all, in the life of every man there were social and business associations, and it was a serious thing by this new form of statute to remove a man from one part of the country to another. [Nationalist laughter.] Although this was a laughing matter for hon. Members below the gangway, he did not think they had grasped the fact that the new tenant might have been in his holding for a quarter of a century. The Government knew that there was really no necessity for this Bill. They were acting in a most harsh, unjust, and tyrannical way to men whose only fault was that they had paid their rent and had done their duty, in order to favour others who had not.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG said that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary had used most uncontrovertible arguments in favour of accepting this Amendment. He had said that to accept it would be to rob the Act of one-half of its chief virtues. Then the Attorney-General came on the scene at a later stage and informed the Committee that the Estates Commissioners were above reproach and most sagacious men in all respects, and that they would never dream of turning a man out of his farm until the end of the year. They would have to give six months notice and no man could be put out at the end of this year, so that eighteen months must elapse before these men could be reinstated. But the Chief Secretary never intended that eighteen months should elapse before these evicted tenants were reinstated. The right hon. Gentleman refused the Amendment to postpone the operation of the Act for twelve months after its passing. Both the right hon. Gentleman and the Attorney-General adduced totally different arguments, arguments in direct opposition to each other and neither of which would have been accepted by anyone except the present House of Commons. Another thing which the Attorney-General had said was that no matter what notice was given the unsuitability of the date of the notice would be taken into account in fixing the market value of the farm. It could not possibly be taken into account. The Estates Commissioners fixed the value, and they would not know within a couple of months the time when a tenant would be compelled to give up the farm, and those two months might make a considerable difference. There was no suggestion that the Estates Commissioners would revise the value of the farm when the date was decided as to when it should be given up. They would decide that a farm of a new tenant was to be acquired for the purpose of reinstating an evicted tenant, and after the price which they were to pay to the outgoing tenant and the owner of the soil had been fixed, they would give notice to the new tenant. No price, unless it was fixed on a very extravagant outside scale by the Estates Commissioners in nearly every case where the tenancy was determined at unsuitable dates, could result in anything else than the outgoing tenant being a considerable loser. For these reasons he hoped the right hon. Gentleman might yet see that it was unreasonable for him to tie down these men to this short and inadequate notice.

Mr. CHERRY said the hon. Gentleman seemed to think he had discovered some incontrovertible argument, but he himself had been impressed in the directly contrary way. The hon. Member had said that under this Bill it would be impossible to get persons into these holdings until the end of 1908. That was true. The tenants must be served with notice, but the Commissioners could not give notice until they had acquired the untenanted land. The Bill would not be got through until August. Then there would be a month or two to make rules which would bring them to October, and the Commissioners would commence their compulsory proceedings about November. It would be impossible to have the land in their possession before the end of the following May, because the process to obtain it would certainly take six months, and then they might serve their six months notice and be in possession of the new holding by the end of 1908. But the effect of the Amendment would be to delay the matter one year and they would not be in possession until 1909.

Mr. MOORE said the Committee had been so entertained by the denunciations of the right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury bench that they were likely to lose sight of the real effect of this Amendment. If this was a case of an ordinary landlord not one could get rid of a present tenant or a future tenant without twelve months notice, but the Estates Commissioners were to be put in the position of being able to get rid of future tenants with six months notice. This was a penal clause against the future tenants. They were to have six months in order to make up their minds whether they should take a farm which not they themselves had found but somebody else had found for them. Why should these men be hustled? They were entitled to twelve months notice and he saw no reason why the notice should be cut down to six months. In fact, if the Committee adopted the principle the hon. Member for North Louth had suggested, instead of getting the new tenants out of their holdings in three months it would take three years. The proposal of the Amendment was that a man should have twelve months' notice to give him time to look about him to see if the farm would suit him. Six months was a very short time to find out whether the farm was suitable.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 291; Noes, 69. (Division List No. 310.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J H (Essex, Romf'rd)
Birrell, Rt. Hn. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brooke, Stopford
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grints'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Farrell, James Patrick
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey

Hudson, Walter
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson, Charles N. (Donc'st'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Owen, C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T. F. (Wolverhampt'n
Richardson, A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Rt Hn E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn Sir Alex F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn Sir H
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Banbury, Sir Frederick George.
Baring, Capt. Hn. G (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Dalrymple, Viscount
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan, Robt. (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Hunt, Rowland

Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Moore, William
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton
Starky, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Wards, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Charles Craig and Mr. Ashley.

MR. MOORE moved an Amendment providing that the Commissioners' notice to a new tenant should have the effect of determining his tenancy as from the date mentioned in the notice not being less than six months from the "gale day next after the service of such notice." His object, he said, was that the notice to quit should expire on gale day, and the adoption of the Amendment would be in the interests of the Commissioners themselves, and would suit the arrangements of the tenants. The gale term was from the 1st May to 12th November, and that old custom was still kept up in some parts of the country. If liberty were given to serve six months notice in the middle of the wrong month, if he might so speak, to end in the middle of the wrong month, rent was being paid all the time by the tenants, and that would lead to the necessity in every case of apportioning the rent, a very troublesome matter; whereas, if the eviction took place on gale day, there would be no question of apportioning the rent, for it was the proper time for settlements, the tenants being in the habit of paying rent on gale day. There was really no comparison between gale day and any other day in regard to the convenience of the tenant, which he thought the Committee ought to consider to some extent. This point also affected the labourers. The farms, a good many of them, were large and the labourers upon them were engaged from the 1st May and were bound to serve for six months. Therefore, it was for the convenience of the labourers as well as the tenants that the notice should be effective on the last gale day of the year. He thought that would be in the interests of the speedy working of the Act; it would save inconvenience, and to a certain extent would be showing consideration to the new tenant, though possibly that might be a reason why hon. Members below the gangway would oppose his Amendment. He thought they ought to try to meet the convenience of those tenants, and there was no doubt that, in the circumstances of the case, the notice ought to expire on gale day. Having regard to the fact that the Committee had already decided on the period of six months definitely, he begged to move his Amendment as "from gale day next."

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 31, to leave out the words 'service thereof,' and insert the words 'gale day next after the service of such notice.'"—(*Mr. Moore.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. BIRRELL said it was provided that the notice to quit should not be less than six months. The Estates Commissioners had to take into consideration all the circumstances, but as a minimum the notice must be six months. This was an emergency measure, and it could not be justified on any other grounds, although on those grounds it could be amply justified. They wanted to deal with this matter as quickly as possible. They were not disposed to lay themselves open to any risks, and they had provided in this clause for ample notice. It might be a longer period if the Estates Commissioners thought it would be desirable, and they had ample latitude to regulate their conduct according to the necessities of the case. He could not bring himself to believe that any single new tenant under the arrangements of this Bill would be treated with harshness, because he would have had ample notice by inspection of his land, there would have been all the proceedings of the Estates Commissioners seeking to acquire the title of the land, and there was not the faintest reason to suppose that he would be taken unawares. The new tenant would be offered a new farm; he would have time to make himself acquainted with it, and if he did not want it he need not take it. If he refused the offer he would be given compensation. The hardship in the case consisted in his being required to give up his farm, just as there was a hardship in a man being made to turn out of his ancestral hall. Some hon. Members thought there was some hardship in a tenant giving up his land to a man who was there before him, but he did not see any hardship in allowing the Court to consider their cases. The Estates Commissioners had full control over them, and they could decide whether it was right and equitable to ask one of these new planters to go out. He felt satisfied that they must act quickly, and instead of adopting dilatory proceedings they must adhere to the principle of the Bill.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 301; Noes, 73. (Division List No. 311.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J H (Essex, Romford
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hn. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett C. H. (Sussex E Grinstead
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Farrell, James Patrick
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Grayson, Albert Victor
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman

Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederick C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, JohnGordonSwift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, JohnM.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, SirC.B.(Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morton, AlpheusCleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson, CharlesN.(Doncaster
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt.Cecil William
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon, N,
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax,
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C E.(Edinburgh, Central)
Price, RobertJohn(Nofolk, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, Rt.Hn.E.(Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A.H(Ashton-under-Lyne)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, SirA.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, SirJohn L.(Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Wardle, George J.
Wason, RtHnE. (Clackmannan
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh, N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, RtHnSir Alex. F.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Banbury, SirFrederickGeorge
Baring, Capt.Hn.G.(Winchest'r
Barrie, H.T.(Londonderry, N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Campbell, Rt.Hn. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cavendish, Rt.Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt.Hn.J. (Birmingham
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim, S.
Dalrymple, Viscount
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gretton, John
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt.Hon. SirJohnH.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt.Hon.Col.W.
King, SirHenrySeymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt.Hn. Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long, Col. CharlesW.(Evesham

Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Moore and Mr. Remnant.

Mr. MOORE moved an Amendment to provide that where the Estates Commissioners acquired any tenanted land under this Act the notice to quit should be served on the occupier within three years after the land had been acquired. He hoped the Amendment would be accepted by the Government, because he was sure that everyone interested in the question would be glad to have some finality. When the Estates Commissioners had bought an estate, they were to have the right of giving what were described as "new tenants" notice to quit. The Chief Secretary had said that any new tenant would know easily without formal notice whether he had to go or not. It was not too much to ask the Commissioners to decide within three years after they had acquired an estate whether they were going to get rid of a new tenant or not. It was bad enough for a new tenant to be on tenterhooks for three years while the Estates Commissioners were making up their minds what action they would take. This was a perfectly reasonable limitation to put in. If these people were to be turned out, their period of uncertainty—a grave and anxious period for many of them—should not be allowed to extend beyond three years. The Amendment would safeguard them from having to go through an indefinite period of anxiety with the risk of being turned out at some remote time.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 31, at the end of Sub-section (1) to insert the words, 'Provided that such notice shall be served within three years after the land has been acquired.'"—(*Mr. Moore.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. BIRRELL said he could not see that there was any necessity whatsoever for a limitation of this kind. The Estates Commissioners knew the gravity of the circumstances of the case; they fully recognised that a disagreeable business was being put upon them, and their only desire would be to get rid of it as speedily as possible. Hon. Members opposite had stated an imaginary hardship that would be imposed on the new tenants. The tenants were represented. He was perpectly certain that if they were only made acquainted with the terms of the measure most of them would think that they were afforded good opportunities for making beneficial use of their holdings; they could have new farms if they wanted them, or full compensation if they preferred to go out, in which case they would, at all events, get money to try their luck elsewhere. He did not admit that any hardship was being imposed on them, or that they were in any way being interfered with in the ordinary course of the culture of their land. Nobody could form any estimate as to how many new tenants would be served with notices. That would depend on a variety of circumstances, and it might be found that the number of cases in which notices would be given were comparatively few.

Mr. WALTER LONG said the Chief Secretary took a remarkable view of the new tenants. He seemed to think the new tenants were different in their tastes and inclinations from all the other agricultural tenants in Ireland. He, himself, did not think that opinion was well-founded. It might be that some of them answered the description which the Chief Secretary and the Attorney-General had given, but he thought the rest of them did not differ from the other agricultural tenants in their liking for home or in their knowledge of business. The Chief Secretary had repudiated any suggestion of that kind, and time would show who was right. He thought the right hon. Gentleman was lumping them together in one class, whereas he would find that there were two quite different sets of them, and that in all probability the majority would not take the view which he and the Attorney-General took.

MR. BIRRELL: The right hon. Gentleman must not assume that notice wlil be given to every new tenant.

MR. WALTER LONG said he was not assuming that. He did not suppose that the land every new tenant was occupying would be required for the purposes of this Bill when other land could be used. He was attributing to the Estates Commissioners no *mala fides* in the performance of their disagreeable task. The Chief Secretary had stated that the Estates Commissioners did not wish this task put upon them. He could well believe that, and it was a most unfortunate thing that the Government had decided to do so. They had enough work to do in the carrying out of the Act of 1903. The duty of extreme difficulty which was now to be cast upon them was to be made more difficult by the refusal of the Government to put in the statute what they had frequently put in their speeches, namely, that the Bill was intended for a temporary purpose which was to be brought to a conclusion within a reasonable time. The Government had again and again declared that the Bill was intended to apply only to a limited number of persons and to operate only for a limited time. The Chief Secretary believed that there would not be a considerable amount of pressure brought to bear on the Estates Commissioners to deal with more than 2,000 cases. When he and his friends on that side of the House talked of pressure they did not mean illegitimate pressure, or pressure which would be used in an improper way. What they meant was perfectly legitimate pressure by those who wished to be regarded as evicted tenants. If a reasonable time-limit was stated in the Bill, all who brought their cases before the Estates Commissioners would know that, unless their claims were satisfied within that time, there were insuperable reasons against the claims, or that there had been blameworthy delay on their part in making the claims. He could not understand why, in view of their protestations that the Bill was intended for only a limited purpose, the Government did not accept the Amendment which would give effect to their own words. The Chief Secretary had said that they on the Opposition side of the House talked as if all the sitting tenants were going to be displaced. They did not say that, but they thought that when this Bill became law the new tenant who had spent time and labour on his farm would believe that there was a good prospect of his displacement. And with all these conditions before him there would be unsettlement in his mind, which would lead him not to take the same interest in his holding. The Amendment seemed to be most reasonable, and carried out what the Government had said was their desire. He could not believe that either the Chief Secretary or the Attorney-General had seriously considered what they were saying when they alleged that to displace a man from his holding, if he were doing well, would be no hardship provided he was paid for it. The foundation of all the trouble in Ireland was the sentiment which attached the peasants and small farmers to their holdings. And why were they restoring the evicted tenants now? It was because the Government said that the men who had been evicted for twenty-three or twenty-four years from their holding for non-payment of rent still retained that sentiment. But did not the same sentiment exist among the men who had been on these farms for twenty-three or twenty-four years and in some cases twenty-eight years and who had made these holdings a success? The majority of them were not bogus tenants who had taken no interest in their holdings nor tried to develop them and make the best of them. Many of them were successful agriculturists; and unless some such limit as was suggested were put into the Bill, a great injury would be done to the tenants owing to the feeling of insecurity. To do this injustice in order to restore evicted tenants could not be justified.

MR. BARRIE said he was sorry that the Chief Secretary had refused to accept the limit as proposed. New tenants should know for how long the sword was to be suspended over their heads. He quite differed from the view expressed by the Government that these tenants were going to have a good thing done to them. The vast majority of them were really first class agriculturists—men who were not afraid to take their courage in both hands and to take these farms when many of them were left derelict, not through anything that the landlord had done, but because of the action of a certain body to which he would not further refer. These men had many of them come to these holdings twenty years ago, and had been successful on them as they had been in other parts of Ireland. They had shown by the improvements they had effected that they knew their business. They were a credit to the district in which they lived, even though the Attorney-General for Ireland had called them centres of disturbance. Under the operation of the Bill they were to have this unkind reward for all they had done. It would not make for the peace of the districts or for good husbandry for these agriculturists to have this unkind fate hanging over them without some time limit. Money compensation would not compensate them for the summary dismissal that was to be their fate. It was in the interests of the peace of the districts and only fair to the tenants that some such time limit as was now proposed should be inserted in the Bill. If three years were too short let the Chief Secretary suggest some reasonable time. If the matter were as urgent as the Government made out, such a limit would help matters.

MR. CLANCY said that one of the ideas most eloquently expounded by the opponents of the Bill was that there should be no priority given to the evicted tenants in cases of restoration, but the effect of the Amendment before the Committee would compel the Estates Commissioners to give priority to the new tenants. After such inconsistency he hoped the Government had no intention of giving way.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG pointed out that the ten or twelve eminently reasonable Amendments which had been submitted Unionist Members had all been ruthlessly brushed aside as though they were unreasonable and absurd. The Chief Secretary had said that not many sitting tenants would be asked to leave their holdings, but he and his friends knew quite well that the greatest effort would be made by Nationalist Members, who had great influence in Ireland.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: We are not conscious of it.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said that giants were rarely conscious of their strength; and that influence would be used to get every one of these new tenants put out of his farm and the original occupant, or his descendant, reinstated. The United Irish League would be sure to exert its influence in this matter, and the tenant would be constantly apprehensive that he might be the next to be turned out; but yet the Government declared that these men had nothing to complain of, and that their lot was a perfectly happy one. In many ways the uncertainty would be a hardship to the tenant. There was the question of schooling for the children and so on, and all these things would be kept hanging over the heads of these unfortunate people, while the only excuse given was that the measure was urgent. The right hon. Gentleman's idea seemed to be that the whole business should be carried through within four or five years. But he did not see why he should object to three years as the period to be fixed. Surely it was not too much to ask the Commissioners to say within three years whether a man should be turned out or not. The Bill was coming into operation within two months and it seemed to him that three years was more than a reasonable time to allow for this purpose. Moreover, to refuse to put a limit upon the time within which the preliminary notices should be served was to deprive these men of what hon. Members below the gangway had been agitating for for a long time, namely, fixity of tenure. They would be kept in a state of suspense with this sword of Damocles hanging over their heads for a very long period. The Chief Secretary apparently had a fixed determination not to accept any Amendment of any sort or kind from that side of the House. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh!"] Well, that was the only conclusion they could come to after the discussion of the last ten or twelve Amendments which the right hon. Gentleman himself had admitted to be reasonable. He thought it was an unprecedented state of affairs that the Bill upon which they had been engaged for three days should go forward without a single word of Amendment.

*THE CHAIRMAN said he must remind the hon. Member that his remarks were not germane to the Amendment before the Committee.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said that the proceedings had become a farce. It was insulting that they should argue there day after day and hour after hour, and the Attorney-General for Ireland or the Chief Secretary budge not a single inch to meet them in any way. He repeated that the present state of affairs came perilously near to insult, although he knew that the Chief Secretary did not think it a serious thing to insult a small minority.

MR. BIRRELL: I never insulted anybody.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said he had heard many expressions from the right hon. Gentleman which he regarded as insults, although the right hon. Gentleman's idea of insult and his might not agree.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Really, Mr. Chairman, I must ask what is the question before the House.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member must confine himself to the Amendment before the House.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said he thought that there might be some hon. Members on the opposite side of the House who would listen to the appeals which were made from the Opposition side that a limitation should be put upon the operations under the Bill, so that men should not be left in a state of uncertainty. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that there was urgency in the matter. The Amendment would secure that urgency would be recognised, because the Commissioners would know that they had only three years in which to make up their minds, and that they would have to carry out the provisions of the Bill in that time. Therefore, so far from hindering the Bill from coming into operation and destroying the urgency of its character the Amendment would go in that direction. It was well to have unpleasant things over as speedily as possible, and therefore he supported the Amendment.

SIR C. HILL (Shrewsbury), who appealed to the Chief Secretary to give them something in the nature of a concession, considered that the Amendment was a reasonable one. He was sure that the Chief Secretary would not think that they wanted to obstruct, but he thought they ought to be met in some manner. The hon. Member was proceeding to refer to some of the details of the Bill when

*THE CHAIRMAN said that his remarks were not relevant to the Amendment before the House.

MR. T. L. CORBETT said that the Amendment was a most fair and reasonable one. It simply provided that men who had been living on their holdings for a quarter of a century and over, should not have this sword of Damocles suspended over them. He hoped the Government would come to a just decision in the matter and accept the Amendment. The Bill was one which might be worthy of the Empress of China, but it certainly was not worthy of the House of Commons. If hon. Members had listened at all to the arguments of the right hon. Member for South Dublin, they must have seen that the suspense which hung over the heads of these men must tend to bad farming. He would not repeat the arguments of sentiment that had been used, but he certainly thought that some of the sentiment should be kept for those who stood in closer relation to these farms than the evicted tenants; for those whose families had been born on these farms, who had known no other home, and whose associations, social and business, were wholly gathered round them.

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL said it was exceeding difficult to impress hon. Members opposite with any of the Amendments which were proposed from the Opposition side of the House. If they proposed to extend the scope of the Bill, they were told it was a question of urgency, and now when in the interest of urgency they proposed a limit of time in which these compulsory powers were to come to an end as regarded the new tenants it was rejected. Such limitations were universal in Acts of Parliament. Under the Lands Clauses Acts a period was fixed. Under every special Act he had known or read which incorporated the Lands Clauses Acts, the time was limited; yet in this matter, which was so urgent that it would not admit of the extension of a day when they asked that the fate of the new tenant should be known in three years the right hon. Gentleman was no longer a middle-aged man in a hurry, but a disappointed politician. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the Committee was not to assume that notice would be given to every one of these new tenants, and he had stated that he would not like to see, nor did he believe that there ought to be, any interference with those new tenants who were to be deemed ordinary farmers. If that was his view why did he not put it in his Bill? Why did he not give these men the knowledge that if they were spared for three years they would not be interfered with at all? Three years was long enough to keep them in suspense. Did he not know what was going on in Ireland? Many of these men were *bona fide* hard-working farmers, and they had been the victims of intimidation for a long period. What opportunities for the intimidation of the tenants of these farms was not the right hon. Gentleman giving, if he enabled the fear of being expropriated from their holdings to hang over their heads for the rest of their lives. There was no limit whatever in the Bill. He could have understood it if the right hon. Gentleman had put in a limit of five years. He had said that if compulsory powers were not taken it would take five years to settle the question. Therefore it should take less with compulsory powers. Yet when they asked for a limit of three years the Chief Secretary would not listen to it, because the request came from his opponents. The right hon Gentleman was absolutely sincere when he stated that his belief was that the Estates Commissioners would not desire to disturb many of these new tenants who were *bona fide* agriculturists. But the hon. Member for West Waterford stated yesterday most distinctly that the impression left in the minds of the Irish people was that the Government intended by these means to expropriate every one of these new tenants.

Mr. O'SHEE remarked that what he said was that the impression left on the minds of the people of Ireland and upon the minds of himself and some of his colleagues was that the Estates Commissioners were to have the discretion to expropriate any tenants they desired.

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL accepted the hon. Gentleman's statement of what he intended to convey, but his own distinct impression from what the hon. Member said yesterday was that the result would be that the powers of this Bill would be applied to every new tenant without distinction. However, the Attorney-General had left very little doubt about his view of the subject. He had said that one of the great benefits of the Bill would be that they would be able to get rid of the new tenants and thus save the expense of protecting them; that they were centres of disturbance. But if it was not the intention to expropriate the whole of these new tenants why was not some indication to be found on the face of the Bill? Was it fair play or justice or anything approaching it that these men should for the rest of their lives be left under a sentence which might at any time as the result of pressure brought to bear on them or on the Estates Commissioners turn them out of their holdings? Supposing a man was not required to turn out: according to the right hon. and learned Gentleman the people of the district knew that if they interfered with him he would become a centre of disturbance and be got rid of. Although they had not interfered with him before, when this Bill was passed they would do so, and the Government would be placed in the dilemma that they would have either to protect him or to expropriate him. Although he did not for a moment doubt the assurances of the Chief Secretary, he must still ask why he did not provide for this in his Bill? He would like to remind the right hon. Gentleman that while he objected to fetter the discretion of the Estates Commissioners in this way he had fettered their discretion in the case of landowners in a number of ways in Section 6. But so far as these tenants, whose lot had not been the happiest, were concerned and who had carried on their business with great difficulty, the right hon. Gentleman proposed to put upon them an extra burden and expose them to an extra trial for the rest of their lives by putting into the hands of their neighbours a power which could be forged into a weapon for their expropriation and expulsion. The right hon. Gentleman believed the objects of the Bill would be accomplished in three years, because he had said he could not afford to wait five years; then why in the name of justice would he not accept this Amendment which enabled Parliament to say to the new tenant: "If you are not interfered with in the next three years you may know that you are safe."

MR. T. M. HEALY said that hon. Members above the gangway had shown themselves to be such splendid spendthrifts of the public time that no one would suppose that the guillotine fell at 10.30 p.m. It was suggested that these compulsory powers should be exercised within the next three years. What happened in regard to the Leasehold Clauses Act of 1877? It was provided that any leaseholder who desired to break his lease should make application within three years. When that Bill was sent down from the House of Lords it enabled the landlord to break his agreement as well as the tenant within the same period, but the House of Commons insisted upon giving only the tenant the Bill. In every Expiring Laws Continuance Bill the Conservative Government found it necessary to renew these powers. In 1896, the Conservative Government provided that the right of application to break his lease should be made perpetual for the leaseholder. The argument used was this: Was the landlord to be harrassed every year by applications from his tenants to break his lease; was he never to have peace and quietness in relation to his holding? Two years was to be the limit, and the justice of the case seemed to be such that the Conservative Government ultimately provided that at any time a tenant might go into Court with an application to break his tenancy. The Bill now before the House proceeded upon the hypothesis that the evicted tenant should be restored to his holding. There were hundreds of cases to be inquired into of a painful character which would take a considerable time. The Bill could not restore any one of these evicted tenants within eighteen months, and yet they had the calm proposal that in the year 1909, or three years hence, the powers of the Estates Commissioners should lapse. He remembered that in 1881 the late Mr. W. H. Smith made an exactly similar proposal to this with regard to the Land Act of that year. He proposed that the Act of 1881 should come to an end in seven years, which, he said, would be amply sufficient to settle the whole of the fair rents and settle the whole land question in Ireland. The same gentleman who made that proposal was himself afterwards a party to a far more drastic and peremptory, and from his point of view, far more harsh proposal, than Mr. Gladstone had submitted. Not only had seven years elapsed, but three times seven years, and the powers which it was then declared would be entirely exhausted in seven years, were still unexpired, unexhausted, and absolutely necessary. Formerly coercion, which was declared to be abhorrent, was only passed for three years. Who made coercion perpetual in Ireland? Was not the Party that made coercion applicable at any time, taking away the liberties of the whole of the people of Ireland, acting as a perpetual menace to the Irish people, the very Party who were saying that this beneficent measure of assessment was to be put an end to at the close of three years? It was an absurd position that hon. Gentlemen were taking up. At one time they declared that the planters were bogus tenants, so immersed in debt that it was necessary to give notice to their creditors. Two hours had been occupied in discussing the position of the planters, men who had been brought from the north and other parts of Ireland, accompanied by armed policemen, and who were to cultivate that land not with ploughs but with blunderbusses. But they all knew the object of this prolonged discussion. They were on Clause 3, and the real clause of interest to hon. Gentlemen above the gangway was Clause 12, which dealt with the tenure of office of the Estates Commissioners, and upon that they would have some chance of discussing the letter of Mr. Bailey to a certain gentleman, who should be nameless, and the letter of that gentleman to Mr. Bailey. That was what they really wanted to come to, but Gentlemen above the gangway, before they approached that Chesterfieldian correspondence, would take up time in discussing three years, and five years, and the indentures of the planters' children. He begged of them, as at all events the shears must close at half-past ten, to approach some question of public interest. Let them approach at any rate the question of the tenure of the sub-commissioners. His last reason for opposing the Amendment was this. Let them give the planters and crofters a chance. In three years time a Conservative Government might be back in office. Why was all this work to be done against planters under a Liberal Government? If it was to be limited to three years they would hurry up, and the whole work of expropriation and spoliation and hardship would be done under the *régime* of the right hon. Gentleman opposite. But if the time was extended in the way the Bill proposed so that they might be six or seven years over the work, the hon. and learned Gentleman might probably be Chief Secretary for Ireland with Mr. Bailey and Mr. Finucane under his thumb, and then, if the time remained as the Bill proposed, would be the paradise of the land grabbers under the *régime* of a Conservative administration.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 70; Noes, 292. (Division List No. 312.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G (Winchester
Barrie, H.T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gretton, John
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Moore, William
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Robert, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Ashley and Mr. Charles Craig.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)

Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan,C (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Faber, G. H.)Boston)
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferens, T. R.
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan(Hereford,S.)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt Hn Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Grayson, Albert Victor
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N)
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonsh're
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras,E.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness,Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down,S.)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield,H.Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, G.Croydon(Launceston)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan,J.Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts., Bassetlaw)
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncaster
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price,C.E.(Edinburgh,Central)
Price,RobertJohn(Norfolk,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,T.F.(Wolverhampton
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson,Rt. Hn. E.(Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas

Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A. H.(AshtonunderLyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowdon, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley,HnA.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E)
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Walsh, Stephen
Walton,Sir John L. (Leeds,S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward,John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley,John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson,J.W.(WorcestershireN.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

*MR. ASHLEY moved an Amendment providing that the Estates Commissioners should "within three months" from the service of the notice determining the tenancy of a new tenant offer to put him forthwith into possession of another parcel of land. He said he proposed the substitution of the words "within three months, etc.," for the words in the original text, with a view to giving the new tenant sufficient time to go over the new farm offered to him and see whether it would suit him or not. As the Bill stood there was nothing to prevent his having only a week or a fortnight to make up his mind. This proposal would give the tenant three months to make up his mind whether he would take the farm offered to him or accept compensation. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, lines 32 and 33, to leave out the words 'on or before the aforesaid date,' and insert the words 'within three months from the service of the aforesaid notice.' "—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. BIRRELL said he had no objection to the Amendment. Its object was that the new tenant who was going to be provided with a new farm should have a proper opportunity of seeing it in order to decide whether he would prefer to have the farm or refuse it and accept compensation. Although he did not think the words were really necessary it was a proper Amendment to move, and he was perfectly willing to accept it.

Amendment agreed to.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.) moved an Amendment providing that the parcel of land should be one which, "in the opinion of the said Commissioners," was as suitably provided with buildings and other requirements as the original holding. He proposed the insertion of the words quoted in order to remove ambiguity from the clause, and diminish litigation and disputes. The clause was, to some extent, ambiguous, and he thought it was in the interests of all classes that there should be no ambiguity about it. To secure the expeditious working of the Act the words he had suggested were necessary, and they were intended to confer upon the Estates Commissioners discretionary power. They had in the past had occasion to criticise these gentlemen, but they knew that they had been handicapped by the Conservative Government in carrying out their duties. He thought the words he suggested would commend themselves to the Government. It might be said that the words were unnecessary and redundant, but the matter ought to be made absolutely clear. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 39, after the word 'which,' to insert the words 'in the opinion of the said Commissioners.'"—(*Mr. Power.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. CHERRY said he recognised that the Amendment was in accordance with the spirit of the clause, the object of the Government being to make the Commissioners judges in all these matters, and he was prepared to accept it.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG said that for precisely the same reasons which the Attorney-General had given for accepting the Amendment he had decided to oppose it. All through the Bill the Estates Commissioners were made judges in everything, and now the Government were accepting an Amendment which would make them judges as to the suitability of the buildings. He wished to express his entire dissent from the principle of making the Commissioners judges in their own cause throughout the Bill.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT said they were now beginning to realise the reason why the last Amendment was accepted. There was generally a sort of "deal" effected in these matters, and the concession of a reasonable and fair Amendment which had just been made to the Opposition was discounted by the acceptance of the Amendment of the hon. Member below the gangway. They were making the Estates Commissioners absolute dictators in everything.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 264; Noes, 57. (Division List No. 313.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Alden, Percy
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith,Rt.Hon.HerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker,Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bethell,SirJ.H. (Essex,Romf'rd
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Elibank, Master of
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferens, T. R.
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson,J.M. (Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire

Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mankeld, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.

Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkeeny)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T. F. (Wolverhampt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball

Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Wardle, George J.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES, Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cavenidsh, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount

Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gretton, John
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edmd's
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.)

Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Moore, William
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Hugh Barrie and Mr. Charles Craig.

MR. ASHLEY moved an Amendment to provide that, instead of the Estates Commissioners, the tribunal to award compensation to a new tenant who refused to enter on a parcel of land offered to him by the Commissioners, should be a court of arbitration appointed as provided in the schedule to the Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act, 1870. He did not consider it was right that two Estates Commissioners, or even the whole three together, should be the only tribunal to decide what compensation should be given to the new tenant. The decision of the Commissioners was to be final, no provision for appeal being contained in the Bill. If the Amendment was not accepted, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would outline some form of appeal from the Estates Commissioners. The Act of 1870 provided—

> "If both parties concur a single arbitrator may be appointed.
>
> "If both parties do not concur in the appointment of a single arbitrator, each party on the request of the other party shall appoint an arbitrator.
>
> "If for the space of fourteen days after the service by one party or the other of a request made in writing to appoint an arbitrator, such last mentioned party fails to appoint an arbitrator, then upon such failure the party making the request may apply to the Court, and thereupon the dispute shall be decided by the Court in accordance with the provisions of this Act.
>
> "Where more than one arbitrator has been appointed, the arbitrators shall, before they enter upon the matters referred to them, appoint by writing under their hands an umpire to decide on any matters on which they may differ.
>
> "The decision of every umpire on the matters referred to him shall be final."

The proposal in the Amendment had the advantage over the one contained in the Bill that in all probability the arbitrators appointed would be experts who had a first class knowledge of the value of land, and would be able to arrive at a correct conclusion as to the amount of money the new tenant should receive. They would be absolutely impartial. This method of appointing arbitrators was embodied in the Arbitration Act of 1889, and in the Lands Clauses Acts, of which one or two clauses were embodied in this Bill. It appeared, therefore, that the right hon. Gentleman thought some portions of the Lands Clauses Acts were good. Perhaps he might think that other portions could be introduced in this measure. The Lands Clauses Acts had been in force for sixty years, and had worked satisfactorily.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 4, lines 2 and 3, to leave out the words 'the Estates Commissioners,' and insert the words 'a court of arbitration shall be appointed as in the schedule to The Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act, 1870, mentioned and.' "—*(Mr. Ashley.)*

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. BIRRELL said he was sorry he could not accept the Amendment. The question they had to determine here was the value of so many acres of Irish land. He quite agreed that that was an important question, and that the people who had to decide it should have some knowledge of the value of Irish land. That knowledge came not by erudition or study or by university degrees, but could be gained only by knowledge of the different localities. Therefore, they had to find a tribunal which would be likely to have possession of that knowledge and experience, and which should at the same time act with some degree of common sense and similarity of judgment. Therefore they had come to the conclusion that it would be impossible to hope to arrive at any determination of the question by adopting the process of arbitration. Of course, if a single arbitrator could be hit upon, that, no doubt, might be a satisfactory solution of the problem. There was something like that provided in the Lands Clauses Act, although it had not been frequently found practicable, and therefore they could not rely upon it. Then there was the case of double arbitration. The probability was that the two arbitrators would differ, though not materially; they would not look at the figures in the same way; and therefore the umpire was called in. That would involve a great deal of delay and difficulty; on the question of the value of an Irish holding there would be a great variety of opinions, and the Government thought they were entitled to make use of the great knowledge of this subject which the Estates Commissioners had obtained during the last four or five years in different parts of Ireland. The Judges of the Supreme Court were, in his opinion, the last persons to be imported into questions of this sort; he did not think English Judges would ever dream of taking up such cases. His hon. friend had suggested that they should set up machinery under the Irish Land Act to arbitrate on each individual case, and to settle the value of the piece of land affected, rather than hand over the duty to the three Estates Commissioners to deal with the whole of the cases. He hoped he could dissipate the cloud of suspicion with which hon. Gentlemen opposite had veiled the Estates Commissioners. It had been said that this Bill had been drafted by the Estates Commissioners, or a majority of them; and that they had implored that the duties should be placed upon them. He could assure the Committee that the Estates Commissioners had no desire whatever to have those powers thrust upon them, and that they never saw the Bill till after it was drafted, and until they were asked to undertake the heritage imposed upon them. How any three gentlemen could desire that those duties should be imposed upon them he could not see, but the Government knew that the great knowledge which these gentlemen had acquired during the last four or five years as to the value of the land made them a body which would act speedily and without much cost. 80,000 acres of land had to be acquired in Ireland for the purpose of providing accommodation for some 2,000 persons, and it was desirable that that work should be done quickly and fairly.

MR. MOORE: What about an appeal?

MR. BIRRELL said that the hon. Gentleman suggested that each side should appoint a man, and the two men should appoint an umpire. No doubt that was an appeal. There would be a landlord's man and a tenant's man, and a man supposed to be neither a landlord's nor a tenant's man, but an impartial man. The Estates Commissioners were in no sense either landlords' men or tenants' men, and the result would be of no benefit to them. It was nothing to them how much the transaction cost. They were not in the position of the promoters of an undertaking who were anxious to get land in order to run a railway through it, and to get it as cheaply as possible, so that their earning powers should be all the greater.

MR. ASHLEY said that this was an entirely new change. Even under the Labourers Act of last year there were arbitrators appointed.

MR. BIRRELL said that the rural district councils acted quite differently. They were animated by local patriotism, and wanted to see the labourers on the land in order that they might get their votes at the next election, or were perhaps anxious to give their friends a job. The Estates Commissioners, however, had no constituents. They were entitled to the rights of civil servants, whatever those rights might be; and they had no object in getting something for their friends, and did not expect any reward. If the Estates Commissioners could not fix the value of the land to be acquired he did not know who could, and he did not think it possible for anybody to suggest that any land would under the provisions of this Bill be taken at an unfair price. The Commissioners, who would be charged with very difficult duty, did not desire these powers, which, however, he believed would be discharged without fear or favour. They would not be the purchasers of the land; they would acquire it for a public purpose with the Treasury behind them. They would not benefit by the transaction; they would not be actuated by animosity towards landlords. He repudiated the idea that in this matter the Commissioners could be looked upon as being judges in their own cause, or promoters of an undertaking in which they had a personal interest. On the contrary, in discharging the difficult duty of fixing the value of the land, he took them to be perfectly impartial. Sometimes questions were put before the Estates Commissioners of a most difficult character, but these were not subjects of that kind, and he was sure that the Commissioners would act in regard to them in a way in which substantial justice would be done, whether the landlords thought that they had got as much as they ought to have or whether the tenants were satisfied or not. The Opposition in objecting to the Estates Commissioners seemed to him to be straining at a gnat while it swallowed a camel. The Estates Commissioners had been entrusted for years past with very important duties, and now it was said that they could not be trusted to buy a few thousand acres of land and dispose of them to the evicted tenants. He submitted that this was a small matter having regard to the enormous quantity of land passing through the hands of the Estates Commissioners and the Land Commission, and considering the important responsibilities of those who were entrusted with the preservation of law and order in Ireland. He thought the Estates Commissioners would carry through in a perfectly impartial manner the work which they had been trained to do for the last four or five years. He did not dispute that they were appointed for certain other purposes, but under the circumstances he did not think that they had any alternative but to accept the three Estates Commissioners as the tribunal which should deal with the question of evicted tenants.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) observed that yesterday the Chief Secretary said that the right hon. Member for Dublin University had used observations which had filled him with despair, and he now ventured to retort that the right hon. Gentleman's speech filled him with despair. His whole speech showed that the right hon. Gentleman utterly misconceived the objection and the whole attitude of the Opposition in regard to this measure. What they desired to direct the right hon. Gentleman's attention to were the first principles of justice.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Justice to Hottentots.

LORD R. CECIL said that he was not conscious of having said anything which could offend the hon. Member for North Kerry. He was only asking for justice.

MR. FLAVIN: My reference was to Hottentots.

LORD R. CECIL said he understood that that was the case, but it appeared to him to be a most irrelevant observation. As he had said, what he was asking for was justice, and if the Government were to appoint any kind of tribunal the first essential was that it should be impartial. [Mr. BIRRELL: "Hear, hear."] To be impartial this tribunal must fulfil two conditions—it should decide solely on the evidence brought before it and it must command the confidence of those who appealed to it. They must have men who came to the consideration of the questions submitted to them without any preconceived opinion. If men came to the decision of a matter with a preconceived opinion, they were incapable of dealing with it impartially. He knew nothing about the Estates Commissioners, he did not know whether they were good, bad or indifferent. They might be "angels of light" or they might be the contrary so far as he was concerned, but assuming that they were like other people, a wild hypothesis in regard to anything which took place in Ireland, the Government was going to give to them the task of settling the whole matter. First of all, they settled who were to be the applicants and who were to be the landlords they dealt with; then they settled the land to be taken and they went and chose it; then they offered it in exchange for other land without any discussion; and, apparently, having selected a piece of land in the neighbourhood where the tenant lived or in some other county, if the dispossessed persons said: "It is not good enough or is not sufficient," then they were taken away from the administrative side of their duties and put into a judicial position; the Government asked them to come in and decide what was really a dispute between them and the tenant as to the value of the land and as to whether the man should receive compensation in money. Surely that ought not to be looked upon as a judicial inquiry. It reminded him of what was said in "Alice in Wonderland."

> " 'I am the judge, I am the jury.' said cunning
> old Fury,
> 'I will try the whole case and condemn you
> to death.' "

In listening to the Chief Secretary he could not hear any reason against the Amendment, although the right hon. Gentleman talked about similarity of judgments. He did not know anything about that or how it was to be secured in this case. Then the right hon. Gentleman said something about speedy administration. If that was the whole object, and all the Government wanted was to get the thing done, why go before the Estates Commissioners at all? It might just as well be settled by one of the Nationalist Members. But they must have some pretence of justice, and it was said that these Commissioners had a knowledge of the land and were acquainted with these matters. But other people also had a knowledge of the land and were acquainted with them. Apart from the Irish land question he did not think the right hon. Gentleman would have put such a proposal before the House, because he must know that as it stood at present it was indefensible. Indeed no real reason had been offered against the Amendment.

MR. CHERRY, dealing with the suggestion that arbitration should be substituted for the procedure of the Bill, said that the principle of arbitration had been adopted in 1887. The system was in force for many years, but it was found in practice to be so troublesome and costly to all parties that eventually the late Government abolished it in 1896 in the case of compulsory redempton of head rents. With the consent of all parties, the late Government passed an Act abolishing the arbitration, and the matter was left to the unfettered decision of the Land Commissioners. There was a nominal appeal to the Court of Appeal, but the Court had laid it down over and over again that they would not go into questions of fact, and the Land Commission fixed the value in the dispute between the head rent owner and the landowner.

MR. MOORE: Under the supervision of a Judge of the High Court.

MR. CHERRY: Yes. In this Bill the Government had adopted very nearly the same system. They had Estate Commissioners instead of Land Commissioners. It was the Land Commissioners and not the Judge who fixed the value, and the Judge relied on the knowledge of these gentlemen who did justice as between all parties.

MR. WALTER LONG said he was astonished at the arguments adduced by the right hon. and learned Gentleman who had sought to justify the power now proposed to be given to the Land Commission, by comparing the procedure with that in regard to head rents. There was not the smallest analogy between a head rent which carried nothing with it but a money value, and the occupation of a holding which carried with it not only a money value but the whole of the future life and career of the occupant and his wife and family. The Attorney-General looked upon it as a mere bagatelle that a man living in his own house should be turned out. The right hon. and learned Gentleman had said it was not inconvenient to the occupier who was willing to go. Not being a lawyer he could not accept the right hon. and learned Gentleman's view as to the inconvenience felt by the person going out. He thought the inconvenience would be extreme and that the analogy had no relevance whatever. The Chief Secretary's argument, all through, was that the Estates Commissioners were the best men for the purpose of dealing with this question. But that was not the question before the Committee; the question was that they were called upon in the first instance to step in and do certain things—to find land in order to reinstate a particular individual. They selected the individual, and they selected the land on which to put him. The the man was to be rooted out of his home and placed elsewhere. The new farm, according to the Attorney-General, would prove a better holding to the sitting tenant than that which he at present had. The sitting tenant might not take that view; it might be in another county miles away from where he was, or desired to live, and he might say he objected to go there and that the holding offeredwas not proper compensation for the holding which he was giving up, and to that man an appeal was given to the persons who had carried out the transaction to which he objected. Could that be regarded as just? Was there any precedent for it? It was quite true that the Attorney-General had given the illustration of the head rent and used it as an argument against arbitration, but he had carried it somewhat further and used it as a justification for abolishing arbitration and then gave no appeal. They did not pin the right hon. Gentleman down to arbitration; his hon. friend would accept the proposal of the Government if the right hon. Gentleman would propose some alternative kind of appeal. The proposed appeal of the Government had not even the semblance of justice. He could not see why the Government had brought in a Bill of this kind at all. Why did they not bring in a Bill of one clause giving the Commissioners the power to do as they pleased? The right hon. Gentleman said the Estates Commissioners had no constituents to satisfy and would receive no reward for their services, and that it would not be their duty to consider how little they could pay. With a larger Ministerial experience than the right hon. Gentleman he said that to speak of a Government official not being governed by motives of economy and by the desire to do the work as cheaply as possible was to deny all the experience of the public service. These men were just as much bound to consider what they were doing with the money as they would be if it was their own, and to say that because it was public money they would not be governed by this consideration was absurd. A public servant said that, if it was his own money, he could afford to be generous, but, as it was public money, he was governed by the law in its administration. Therefore, it was absurd to say that these men would not be bound by principles of economy. The right hon. Gentleman said that they had no constituents. He was not so certain about that. There were constituents of different kinds. They knew perfectly well that this Bill had been introduced in order to gratify, he did not say whether rightly or wrongly, the Nationalist Members of Parliament, who demanded that the evicted tenants should be restored to their holdings. But would there be no pressure, no criticism, on the part of the public in Ireland if the Estates Commissioners did not give prompt realisation of the hopes raised by this Bill, and if they did not deal in a generous way with the difficulties by which they were confronted? They were asked to leave the whole of this case in the hands of the Estates Commissioners. He agreed with his hon. friend that the Commissioners might all be as clever as the archangel Gabriel, they might do their work as well as possible, but it was inconceivable that there would not be some injustice, some inevitable cases of hardship; and it seemed amazing that the Government were not prepared to provide some court, or some individual, other than the people who had themselves caused the injury, to whom appeal could be made by an aggrieved person. But it was useless to appeal to the Government. They had civil words from the Chief Secretary and learned arguments from the Attorney-General, but they had no attempt made to meet the difficulties which were pointed out. The Government were apparently determined to go steadily on with the policy which they had laid down. All he could say was that the Chief Secretary had told them that the Commissioners did not desire those powers that were being forced upon them, but however reluctant they might be to accept them now, he was confident that they would not have enjoyed them for six months before, with all their hearts, they would wish that they had never been thrown upon them, and would realise that, if injustice was to be avoided, there must be at all events some tribunal to which injured people could appeal.

MR. MOORE thought the Committee would do well to consider the subject matter of the Amendment. They had it on record that it was the intention of the Government through the Estates Commissioners to provide holdings of 40 acres for the evicted tenants. In a light and airy and butterfly manner the Chief Secretary supposed that land could be purchased at £20 an acre, which would do very well. The Chief

Secretary professed righteous indignation when it was suggested that the Commissioners were judges in their own cause, and nadexpressed a feeling of despair at certain arguments addressed to him. He could assure the right hon. Gentleman that despair was not only on his side of the House. He and those around him had submitted Amendments which were admitted by members of the Government to be not only meritorious but reasonable, yet from some reason or other those Amendments were not accepted. When it was said that the Commissioners were not judges in their own cause it was really playing with words. The Estates Commissioners had the public and statutory duty cast upon them to acquire land and to retail it, and when they were fixing the value of the land they had to take into consideration what they would get from the intending purchasers; so that they were judges in their own cause when they proceeded to fix the price to the retail purchaser. They had a direct interest, if they were to solve the problem at all; the whole tribunal would fall into disfavour if they did not effect a replantation, and they could not do it unless they bought land at a price which would enable them to resell without a loss. In England £800 might appear a small sum, but in Ireland it was a very substantial amount. In the County Court in Ireland the limit of jurisdiction was £500. Here were 40 acres at £20, to be bought for £800, and he did not suppose that the Commissioners would be so foolish as to acquire only one holding at a time on different estates with different considerations of title. They would buy three or four holdings on an estate at one price and one expense, and this gave £2,400 as subject matter of the Amendment. Those on his side of the House were determined that, if the Commissioners were to take the land and decide the price, there must be some sort of revision of their decision. There was one way of escape from revision, and that was under the Amendment of his hon. friend, because there was never an appeal from an arbitration award, save to the High Court where the arbitrator went wrong on points of law. Arbitration had worked very well under the Land Acts of 1870 and 1880, before the Land Commission was born, and if they deliberately rejected arbitration, from which there was no appeal, he did not see how they were going reasonably to refuse some form of revision of the decision of the Estates Commissioners, who were at once plaintiffs, judge, and jury in their own cause. The Attorney-General had stated that the Unionist Government in 1896, in the matter of the redemption of head rents, had abolished the principle of arbitration. That was perfectly true, but they substituted a form of revision by a tribunal presided over by a Judge of the High Court. But here the only cry they heard from the Government was that the Estates Commissioners were so honest. Aristides was driven into exile because the people were tired of hearing him called honest. The answer to every objection was that the Estates Commissioners were honest. They wanted the answer of the Government brought down to the points they made. It was no answer to say that because the Government had unlimited confidence in the Commissioners, therefore, arbitration should not be resorted to. He took it that there was not to be any arbitration; was there to be any appeal? If land was taken compulsorily under any other statute, the owner or tenants had some way of having the matter rectified. If a railway company desired to take any land or it was required under the Housing Act or for any public purpose whatever, there was a special schedule fixing the compensation to be paid and an arbitration with or without a jury was provided for.

Mr. CHERRY: Would you like a jury?

Mr. MOORE said that would come up later. At present they were anxious to learn what reasons the Government had for rejecting arbitration. The fact that the Estates Commissioners could fix their own price for the land that they took, without the occupiers having any right of appeal or even the protection of a public hearing, seemed highly amusing to the Attorney-General for Ireland, but it was a serious matter for the people who were to be dispossessed. The right hon. Gentleman had said the new tenants were obstinate and occasioned a large amount of expense in respect of police protection, and that it was in their own interest that they should go to some other neighbourhood where they would be welcomed and could become good citizens; but he did not know that they would be any better off than those who had left the Clanricarde estates and had been hunted with sticks. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: It is not true.] It would be a very unfortunate thing if these people were to be dispossessed that there should be no guarantee under the Act that the decisions of the Estates Commissioners would be subject to revision. It would not tend to create public confidence in the working of the Act.

MR. T. M. HEALY said he preferred the hon. and learned Member's reference to Mr. Bailey as Aristides to his letter of March 19. The other night Aristides was to be tried by the hon. and learned Gentleman as soon as he came into office, and instead of Aristides getting an oyster shell he was to get a Royal Commission, presided over by the hon. and learned Gentleman himself. Now Mr. Bailey had become the gentleman whom the Greeks were tired of calling "the just." But in the letter of March 19—"Bailey," said he, "you are appointed to hold the scales between Finucane and Wrench, neither of whom was just." Which of them was Aristides? It could not have been Finucane; it could not have been Wrench, because Aristides had hold of the golden scales between them, and therefore the result of the hon. and learned Gentleman's lucubrations to-night was that Mr. Bailey alone was fit to bear the mantle of Aristides. Every effort in that House had been devoted to a simplification of procedure where compulsion had been a necessity. Under the Workmen's Dwellings Act they could take £1,000 worth of property, and on the bare award of an arbitrator, without a jury and without appeal, in the interests of the working man, the decision of the tribunal was final. Why was that? Because it was felt that in relation to working men's dwellings it was desirable to give a cheap and speedy procedure. When the Labourers Act was passed that was grafted on to it, so that when taking an acre of land compulsorily the same procedure was applied. Now the hon. and learned Gentleman supported an arbitration; but who was going to pay for those awards? The two arbitrators commonly appointed an umpire, and if they paid 20 guineas a day to each and allowed for the expense of the shorthand writer, a room, etc., they would have an expenditure of 100 guineas a day, and these contentious cases might last two days. Thus in an £800 case they proposed to put the cost of a fourth of the total sum in question upon the parties for an arbitration. Was there any Government out of Bedlam that could accept such an Amendment? The hon. and learned Member would one day be sitting on the Treasury Bench, and he would remind him that these sayings of his would be on record in the pages of *Hansard* — that work which was quoted in the House as if it were as sacred as the Bible. And with that brief period looming ahead, in which the hon. and learned Gentleman proposed to apply to Mr. Bailey what he would call, for short, the "dry shampoo," was it worth while for a man of his seriousness and solemnity to be engaged in that light-handed extravaganza? No, it was not. The Front Benches had again and again shown their reasonableness in this matter, but there came up fresh crops of Orangemen—he would not say fresh crops of fools, because that would be unparliamentary—but they were callow birds; the Chief Secretary had applied to them a term drawn from the rookery which he would not venture to apply to them, but he would ask them to take a lesson from hon. Members who were their elders, and remember that they were dealing with a serious Irish problem which went to the root of the life of the country. And, therefore, he would beg hon. Gentlemen above the gangway to address themselves to these problems with a more serious mind.

MR. BARRIE said he would address himself to the matter now under review rather than to the earlier portion of the bright and interesting speech of the hon. Member for North Louth. They were now dealing with the proposal that what were called the "new tenants"—although in some cases they might have been in possession of their holdings for twenty-eight years—should be placed absolutely in the power of the Estates Commissioners, who were to be able to say whether these men were to continue in their holdings or to lose them on six months notice. It was proposed by the Bill that the compensation to be paid to these men, if they were dispossessed, should be decreed arbitrarily by the Estates Commissioners. He was not going to say a single word about the Estates Commissioners. He had no acquaintance with these gentlemen, and therefore he had no right to criticise them. He preferred to say they were honourable men fit for the position they occupied, and that it was sought to impose upon them a duty from which they, as honourable men, would wish to be free. As one with some slight knowledge of a court of arbitration he did not believe that such a court would be as costly as had been stated by the hon. and learned Member for North Louth. He confessed he had no knowledge of arbitration courts where the costs ran so high as the hon. and learned Member had prophesied they would do in the cases where new tenants who were displaced in favour of evicted tenants were dissatisfied with the offer of the Estates Commissioners. He hoped it was not too late for the Government to reconsider the matter. It was not only un-British, but un-Irish that a body of three gentlemen should have the power of decreeing that certain tenants were to vacate their farms on short notice, and also of deciding the amount of compensation they were to have for that compulsory removal. That was a provision hitherto unheard of in British legislation. He thought a great deal would be done to facilitate the working of the measure if this duty were taken from the Commissioners and placed upon some neutral body. He did not care how the arbitration court might be constituted, but he said it was the duty of the Government to set up some form of arbitration court so that the new tenants who were dispossessed might have confidence that they would be fairly treated.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said his hon. friend the Member for North Londonderry had dealt seriously with the Amendment, and his treatment of it contrasted favourably with the light-hearted extravaganza in which the hon. and learned Member for North Louth had indulged. The present Secretary of State for India, when he introduced the Evicted Tenants Bill in 1894, which measure had much the same object as the present Bill, did not suggest that the Land Commissioners should carry out the very onerous and serious duties now proposed. The right hon. Gentleman proposed then to set up an entirely fresh tribunal for that purpose. Moreover, in that Bill some sort of appeal was provided. But it was now suggested that the three Estates Commissioners, who had already an immense quantity of work to do, and were in fact taxed to their utmost, should have additional responsibility thrown upon them. It was a proposal totally different from anything to be found either in the Housing of the Working Classes Act or the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act. The present Bill had for its object the dispossessing of one class of persons to put in another. That was a high-handed proceeding, and all the dictates of justice and common-sense suggested that such a proposal should be hedged round with every safeguard for the purpose of ensuring a fair hearing and a fair trial. It was suggested that there should be an appeal to the county court, but it would be admitted that an appeal to the county court——

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: We cannot discuss the proposed appeal to the county court under the Amendment now before the Committee. That will come up later on another Amendment.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said he would bow to the Chairman's ruling, and endeavour to restrict his observations to the Amendment. He wished the Committee to realise the circumstances under which they were asked to set up some form of tribunal other than the Estates Commissioners which was not only to fix the price of the land, but where the displaced tenant was to go. The tenant whose present residence was in the county of Mayo or

Wicklow, might be sent to the county of Derry. That might inflict a great injury on the unfortunate peasant which was contrary to all sense of justice.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN called the hon. Member to order. He was repeating two or three times arguments with which the Amendment had nothing to do.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said that there was one more objection to giving these powers to the Estates Commissioners who would have practically no knowledge of the land to be dealt with. The Estates Commissioners would have to depend entirely on the report of an inspector, who had no practical knowledge of the value of land in the particular district where the sitting tenant was to be displaced, and no knowledge of the county in which the farm was situated that was to be placed at his disposal. All the inspector could do would be to go on the land and probably dig up a spadeful of earth and say, "this land is worth so much." He maintained that before that could be done there should be a hearing in some open court as in cases where rents were fixed.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN again called the hon. Member to order. He must confine himself to the question of substituting a court of arbitration for the Estates Commissioners. It was no use discussing these matters which he had ruled over and over again were not germane to the question before the Committee.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said he bowed to the Deputy.Chairman's ruling, but he could not admit that his remarks were not germane to the Amendment.

MR. FLAVIN: Go on, and give us something fresh.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said he hoped the Chief Secretary might still see his way to give them some court of appeal.

MR. T. L. CORBETT thought that considering the way they had been gagged they ought to be protected from the continual interruptions from below the gangway. He thought that there must be some stirrings of conscience in that direction. He observed that the hon. Member for Bath——

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. Gentleman must confine himself to the Amendment.

MR. T. L. CORBETT submitted that this was an Amendment dealing with the tenant in possession. He objected to the term "new tenant" being applied to a man who had been a quarter of a century on a farm.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with the Amendment.

MR. T. L. CORBETT thought he might be allowed to develop his argument. Without this Amendment the tenants in possession would be left to the dictation of theEstates Commissioners. No doubt the men who had evicted those tenants must come into friction with the men whom they had evicted. he asked how it was possible without courts of arbitration, which the Amendment proposed to set up, that three Commissioners could deal with 3,000 cases almost immediately, and possibly 6,000 other cases? As the hon. Member for South Antrim had stated, the proposal of the Bill was to hand over entirely the dealing with these evicted tenants to the three Estates Commissioners, and so paralyse the whole working of the Land Act.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 272; Noes, 51. (Division List No. 314.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon

Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Birrell, Rt. Hn. Augustine
Black. Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Condon,Thomas Joseph
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan,C(Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferens, T. R.
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hn. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Right Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W. Bateman(Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea,HughCecil (St.Pancras,E.)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George,Rt.Hon. David
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M. (FalkirkB'ghs)
Maclean, Donald
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah(Down,S.)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G.Croydon(Launceston)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan,J.Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien,Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearce, Willam (Limehouse)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price,C.E. (Edinburgh,Central)
Price,Robert John (Norfolk,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mptn
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. G.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley,Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Steadman, W. C.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thompson,J.W.H. (Somerset,E

Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Boyle, Sir Edward
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Darlymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Fletcher. J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Moore, William
Nield, Herbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Ashley and Mr. T. L. Corbett.

Mr. MOORE moved an Amendment with the object of providing that where the Estates Commissioners tried to make the new tenant remove to a farm of which he did not approve he should have the option of one more suitable farm before being turned off with money compensation. If the tenant were not satisfied with the first parcel of land he should be offered another. It was said on the other side of the House that many of these new tenants were not good tenants, but their reputation with the Opposition was exactly the opposite as they thought they were entirely satisfactory tenants. He would much rather see these men in new holdings, but when a man in the ordinary way desired to go to a new holding he selected the holding for himself. In the present case the new tenant who was being dispossessed had not the power of selection, although the desire was expressed to assist him to some other farm. The selection was left with these sympathetic Government officials whose duty was to retail without any loss to the State the land which they had compulsorily acquired. It might well be that in their desire to get rid of a certain parcel of land on their hands the Commissioners might say that all the Act required them to do was to see that the land they selected should not be subject to a higher annuity than the tenant was at present paying, and that therefore the tenant must take the piece of land which fulfilled those conditions whether it was suitable to him or not, and that if he did not he should be compulsorily compensated in money value. The right hon. Gentleman had refused to allow them to put any limitation in the Bill, and, that being so, he thought the new tenant should be given some opportunity of a second refusal before he was compulsorily compensated. Many of these new tenants were most anxious to continue farming. They had to spend their lives in farming when they were not engaged in protecting themselves from the assaults of their neighbours, and if a suitable farm was offered to them they would be content, but he thought they should have some chance of the refusal of a second farm if the first one offered to them was not suitable. There were other reasons besides the quality of the land which might render the farm unsuitable. The Estates Commissioners might take a new tenant on the ground alluded to by the Attorney-General, that he was unpopular in the district, and cost too much for police, and migrate him to another part of the country. But it had happened that in parts of Ireland compulsory migrants had not been welcomed by the tenants of that district with the effusion that the right hon. and learned Gentleman seemed to expect. It might be that the environment of a farm offered in this way was such that the irresistible temptation to hold mass meetings on the least provocation might lead the tenant of the farm to suspect that the Estates Commissioners had not properly considered his position when selecting the farm. He, therefore, considered that it was only just and fair that the tenant should have the choice of refusing a second farm before he was told: "Out you go, there is your money." He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not say once more that the Amendment was reasonable, but that he could not accept it and that it was a matter in the discretion of the Estates Commissioners. That did not satisfy them; they believed that the more safeguards they placed in the Bill the more satisfactory it would be to those tenants with whom they at least had some sympathy. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 4, after the word 'heard,' to insert the words "offer him another parcel of land which shall be suitable and in the event of his refusal of such parcel shall.' "—(*Mr. Moore.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. T. M. HEALY said that as the Chief Secretary had been forbidden to speak of the reasonable character of this Amendment he hoped the hon. Member for North Armagh would permit him to recommend this Amendment to the Government in the strongest manner as a most reasonable proposal. It was proposed that, in case a planter was dissatisfied with the farm offered to him, he should have an alternative offer; and, having regard to the advantages of Canada as a field of emigration, and to the fact that there they could get not 40 but 163 acres for nothing, and having regard to the further fact which was the most important of all, namely the bloodthirsty character of these men, and the fact that they could get to Canada by the all-red route, he thought the proposal worthy of support, and he would support it in the most cordial spirit, always provided that that discretion was given to the Estates Commissioners.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG said the Chief Secretary evidently felt debarred from saying anything at all on this Amendment. Could it be considered in any way unreasonable? A man was told to leave his farm and go 20 miles or perhaps 100 miles where another farm awaited him which carried the same annuity that he was now paying and was in other ways suitable. The person who judged that was the inspector. The Estates Commissioners then said that the man must take the land or take a money compensation. That surely was a great hardship, and he was surprised that the hon. Member for North Louth should treat the Amendment with such levity.

Mr. T. M. HEALY said he was never more serious in his life.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG thought the hon. Member had a very curious method of showing it. It was a very serious matter. This was only another example of the want of sympathy which pervaded this Bill. Nothing could be more reasonable than that a man placed in such a position should have a choice of another farm if the one offered did not suit him. It was really a sad thing to hear the Committee treating in this manner a perfectly serious Amendment, which the Goverment could accept without in the slightest degree spoiling or deviating from the principle laid down in the Bill.

Mr. CHERRY said he was really astonished at the moderation of the hon. Member. Why restrict the choice of farms to two? Why not have a choice all over Ireland? Why not give the man a choice of twenty? One man might be offered a farm in Munster and another one in Connaught; were they to have two farms in every county in order that the man might have his choice? Or were they to take the tenants about the country in first class carriages—["Motors!"]—to see which farms they would like? He could not believe that the Amendment was seriously intended. What would be the effect of it? They had heard great complaint about the powers to obtain land compulsorily; it was said to be harsh; but by this Amendment they wanted the Commissioners to take two farms where now it was only proposed to take one. They were to buy two farms in order that each tenant might have his choice. Such a proposal at once doubled the amount of land that would be required. At one time they were told that they were not to take more land than they absolutely required, and at another they were asked to take double the the amount of land they needed. Supposing farms were required by several people, the Commissioners would be bound to take sufficient land to give each tenant his choice of two farms, and, if that were so, what was to become of the farms which were left untenanted? Really he did not think that the Amendment could be intended seriously, and he need not waste the time of the Committee over it.

MR. MOORE said the Amendment was seriously moved, and he regretted that the Committee did not treat it seriously, and that the right hon. Gentleman should have imported into the discussion the suggestion that the tenants should be taken about in first-class carriages. In the first place, it was perfectly easy for the Commissioners to avoid all difficulty by offering a man his choice of two farms, before they proceeded to acquire the land. Considering that under this Bill the Commissioners had power to take land compulsorily, they could ascertain what land was suitable and then proceed to acquire it. If the tenant accepted the farm proposed to him the Commissioners need not buy the other. He did not see anything simpler than that. Though the right hon. Gentleman had treated the proceedings in a spirit of hilarity, he thought it right that a man should have a choice of two farms, however it might be regarded as a matter of joke. The subject ought not to be approached in that spirit. These new tenants had led a very strenuous life, and they were now to be dispossessed and turned out of their farms, some of which they had occupied for twenty-five years and more. He thought that these men ought not to be turned out without their being given the choice of suitable holdings in exchange for those they were compelled to give up; and the Commissioners, with the land they had already, and what they could acquire under the Bill, 80,000 acres, would have plenty of land to enable them to offer the tenant his choice of farms. He deeply regretted the spirit which the Front Bench opposite had shown on this occasion, because it showed how right hon. Gentlemen opposite were accustomed to approach this subject in a spirit of subservience to the unchristian and uncharitable cry against the new tenants raised by hon. Members below the gangway.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) said the Committee was supposed to be trying to hold the scales fairly between different classes of the population over whom the chances of the election had given them power. In this case they were dealing with the life prospects of men whose fate depended on the action taken under this Bill. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: How about Horne?] Nothing illustrated better the spirit in which these matters were being dealt with than that irrelevant, and, might he say, in plain language, that vulgar and unworthy interruption. He asked the Committee to consider what would be the feelings of these men whose fate they were deciding if they could hear the way in which their case was met by those who were, he supposed, their fellow-countrymen. These men had a right to expect that their feelings should be treated by that House with respect and courtesy. He regretted very much that fair consideration was not given to their case. The Amendment was a fair and worthy proposition, deserving of courteous treatment. He confessed to a personal lack of knowledge upon this subject, but he could well understand that there were among this class of tenant a large number who were worthy of fair play and fair treatment. What would they think when they read the reports of what was happening in this House? They would say that they had been made fools of. [Cries of "Question."] They would say that no respect had been paid to their feelings, that they had been made the laughing-stock of the House of Commons by the action of hon. Members below the gangway, and they had not found any defenders on the Front Ministerial Bench whose duty it was to see that they got fair play. Many of these men, to whom this removal meant ruin and destruction, could not help feeling intense resentment. A home was not made up of acres only, but of its surroundings, its amenities, and its possibilities for instruction. Some consideration ought, therefore, to be shown to men who were taken away from their homes in order to give them some choice of selection. [NATIONALIST cries of "Horne."] He had neither liking nor respect for hon. Members below the gangway [Laughter and cheers]; and he was glad to think that the prejudices of his past life—— [NATIONALIST cheers and cries of "Order."]

THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The right hon. and gallant Gentleman must not go beyond the limits of the Amendment.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY said he would confine himself to the Amendment if the Chairman would see that hon. Members kept order. [Cries of "Chair."] When the Chairman called him to order he knew how to reply, and when hon. Members opposite called him to order he knew how to reply to them. [Cries of "Order" and "Speak up."] He had had to face many interruptions and a good deal of insult because he had championed the cause of those who had been ill-treated. The Amendment would at least do something to relieve the harshness of treatment with which they were threatened. He believed that his attitude was not without sympathy on the part of hon. Members opposite. ["Oh, oh."] He did not think that those who laughed at him represented the best of the Liberal Party. [Cries of "Question."] At any rate, he was not ashamed to raise his voice on behalf of what he honestly believed to be a slight measure of justice and fair play on behalf of those who were without champions, and to put their case as being worthy of the attention of the House.

MR. T. M. HEALY expressed regret that the right hon. Member had been cut short in his tale about his past life. The right hon. Member had stated that he had been met with jeers and insult. So far from that being the case, he could say that, as far as he was concerned, he had shown that he was willing to think Imperially on this question. He had thrown out the suggestion of Colonial preference for the evicted men, but that had not met with the approval of hon. Members. He would make another suggestion. On some estates in England there was a large amount of untenanted land, he would not say from what cause or under what circumstances, because if he did he would be accused of vulgar abuse. As there was such a desire that English landlords should be enabled to acquire the services of these men, and English yeomen might have to be supplanted through disputes about game and things of that sort, a large body of most loyal, hard-working, and contented men could be placed at the service of British agriculturists. If the right hon. and gallant Gentleman would propose to translate to his own county these men from the Clanricarde estate, he could assume him that, at whatever cost, they would be glad to support him in that proposition.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 85; Noes, 331. (Division List No. 315.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beckett, Hon. Gervase

Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn.J.A. (Wor.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, G'v'n
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gretton, John
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F.W.F.(Bury S.E'm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt.Hon.Col.W.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R
Long, Col. Charles W.(Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter (Dublin, S.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morpeth, Viscount
Nield, Herbert
O'Niell, Hon. Robert Torrens
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Smith Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A.Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Moore and Mr. Charles Craig

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt.Hn.Richard Knight
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C.H.(Sussex, E.Grinst'd
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davis, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Eninburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W.H. (St. Pancras, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt.Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt.Hn Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gwynn, Setphen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael

Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W.Bateman (Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King,Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea,Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras,E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Lalkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson,Charles N. (Donc'st'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien,Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson,W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C.(Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Price, C.E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, RobertJohn (Norfolk, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall. Athelstan
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,SirG.Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowden
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J.H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T.(Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley,Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E)
Thompson,J.W.H. (Somerset,E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Vivian, Henry
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward,John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

And, it being after half-past Ten of the clock, the Chairman proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 22nd July, successively to put forthwith the

Questions on the Amendments moved by the Government of which notice had been given, and the Questions necessary to dispose of the Business to be concluded.

Question put, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 336; Noes, 83. (Division List No. 316.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C.H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. C.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Nugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.

Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson,Charles N.(Donc'st'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W.D. (Colchester)
Pearson,W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'th'mpton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C.E. (Edinburgh, Central
Price,Robert John (Norfolk, E.
Priestley,W.E.B. (Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott (Bradf'd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel,Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley,Hn..A. Lyulph (Ches.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas,Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thompson,J.W.H. (Somerset,E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Vivian, Henry
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Wardle, George J.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White,J.D. ((Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams. J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson,Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh.,N.
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Balcarres. Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J.(City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring,Capt.Hn.G (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cavendish,Rt.Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A. (Wor.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark,G'v'n
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks., East)
Gretton, John
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey,F.W.F.(Bury S.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway,Rt.Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hn. Col. W.
Keswick, William
King,Sir Henry Seymour (Hull
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col. A.R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesh'm
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter (Dublin, S.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morpeth, Viscount
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.

Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Clause 4:—

Amendments made—

"In page 4, line 28, after the word 'under,' to insert the words 'the foregoing provisions of.'"

"In page 4, line 30, at the end, to add, '(3) All costs and expenses in the opinion of the Judicial Commissioner necessarily and properly incurred by any petitioner in respect of a petition under this Act, or by any new tenant on a hearing before the Estates Commissioners, or by any person having a claim upon the purchase money of land acquired under this Act in the ascertainment of the title to and distribution of that money, shall be paid as part of the expenses of the Land Commission to the person who incurred such costs or expenses.'"—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Question put, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 336; Noes, 83. (Division List No. 317.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hn. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C.H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W.H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael

Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law,Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea,Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras,E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk Bg'h
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down,S.)
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal,E.)
M‘Callum, John M.
M‘Kean, John
M‘Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M‘Killop, W.
M‘Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson,Charles N(Doncaster
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien,Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, Wiliam
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce,Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,SirW.D. (Colchester)
Pearson,W.H.M.(Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps,Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price,C.E. (Edinb'gh,Central)
Price,Robert John(Norfolk E.)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T.F.(Wolverhampt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts,John H. (Denbighsh.)
Robertson,SirGScott (Bradford
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton underLyne)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw,Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley,Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas,SirA.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E.
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Vivian, Henry
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E (Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson,J.W.(Worcestersh., N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M‘Kinnon
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,RtHn.SirAlex.F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, RtHn.A.J.(City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt.Hn.G(Winchester
Barrie, H. T.(Londonderry, N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cavendish, Rt.Hn.Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A(Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, CharlesCurtis(Antrim, S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gretton, John
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hon.SirJohnH.
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hon.Col.W.
Keswick, William
King,Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long, Col. CharlesW.(Evesham
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin, S.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, JohnFrederickPeel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith,F.E. (Liverpool,Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A.Stanley(York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B.Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Valentia and Lord Edmund Talbot.

Clause 5 :—

Amendment made—

"In page 4, line 40, at the end, to add the words, 'in redemption of an equal amount of the original advance.'"—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Question put, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 332; Noes, 82. (Division List No. 318.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Asquith, Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon, Winston S.
Clancy, John Joseph
Clacke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, SirWm.J(S.Pancras,W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.
Dewar, Sir. J. A (Inverness-sh
Dickinson,W. H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferens, T. R.
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander

Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt.HnHerbertJohn
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Right Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras,E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold

Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.)
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F, (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien,Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N,)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,SirW.D.(Colchester)
Pearson,W.H.M.(Suffolk,Eye)
Philipps,Col.Ivor-S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price,C.E.(Edinburgh,Central)
Price,RobertJohn(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.

Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley,Hn.A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas,SirA.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thompson,J.W.H(Somerset,E.
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward,John(Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)

White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Willaimson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J.(York,W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson,J.W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.SirH.
Balfour,RtHn.A.J. (CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring,Capt.Hn.G(Winchester)
Barrie, H. T.(Londonderry,N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cavendish,Rt.Hon.Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A.(Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,CharlesCurtis(Antrim,S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gretton, John
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hon.Col.W.
Keswick, William
King,SirHenrySeymour(Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long,Col.CharlesW. (Evesham)
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John FrederickPeel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts,S.(Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool,Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson,A.Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B.Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Lord Balcarres.

Clauses 6 and 7 agreed to.

Clause 8 :—

Amendment made—

"In page 5, line 22, at the end, to add, (2) No holding purchased by an evicted tenant, vhether under the Act of 1903 or this Act, hall be made available in any bankruptcy, or y any process or proceeding of law, to pay, atisfy, or discharge, in whole or in part, any ebt contracted or incurred by such evicted tenant prior to the date of the order vesting such holding in him.'"—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Clause 8, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 9 :—

Question put, "That the clause, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 329; Noes, 80. (Division List No. 319.)

AYES.

braham, William(Cork, N.E.)
cland, Francis Dyke
dkins, W. Ryland D.
gnew, George William
insworth, John Stirling
lden, Percy
llen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
llen, Charles P. (Stroud)
mbrose, Robert
rmitage, R.
squith,Rt. HonHerbertHenry
stbury, John Meir
aker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
aker, Joseph A.(Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey(Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard

Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (St. Pancras, W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferens, T. R.
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R.S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson, Charles N (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mptn
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)

Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley,Hn. A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas,Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Vivain, Henry
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward,John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Wason,Rt.Hn E.(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh.,N)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn.Sir Alex.F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J. (City Lond
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring,Capt.Hn.G.(Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cavendish, Rt.Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A.(Worc
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Lloyd
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gretton, John
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey,F.W.F. (Bury S.E'm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway,Rt.Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt.Hn. Col.W.
Keswick, William
King,Sir Henry Seymour (Hull
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col. A.R.
Long,Col. Charles W.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter (Dublin, S.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Nield, Herbert
O'Niell, Hon. Robert Torrens
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts,S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith,F. E.(Liverpool,Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Thomson,W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson,A.Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B.Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Valentia and Lord Edmund Talbot.

Clause 10 :—

Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 328; Noes, 78. (Division List No. 320.)

AYES.

Abraham,William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen,A.Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Asquith,Rt.Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker,Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard

Bellairs, Carlyon
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clancey, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J. (S.Pancras,W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E. Gr'st'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson,W.H. (St. Pancras,N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Cambrone)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferens, T. R.
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope,W.Bateman (Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan,J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson,W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps,Col. Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh,Central)
Price,Robert John (Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford,E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.

Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Willimson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gretton, John
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark,
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Forster.

Clause 11 :—

Amendment made—

"In page 5, line 36, after the word 'agreement,' to insert the words 'and the provisions of section fourteen of The Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1887, with respect to money paid into the Bank of Ireland shall apply where money is so paid under this Act."—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Question, "That Clause 11, as amended, stand part of the Bill," put, and agreed to.

Clause 12:

Amendment made—

"In page 6, line 2, leave out from the word 'as,' to end of line 4, and insert the words 'if they were county court judges in Ireland.'"—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Question put, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 312; Noes, 75. (Division List No. 321.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Berridge, T. H. D.
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn Richard Knight
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J (S. Pancras, W.)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Dengbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferens, T. R.
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)

Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson,W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps,Col. Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C.E.(Edinburgh,Central)
Price, RobertJohn(Norfolk, E.)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea,Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,T.F (Wolverh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, SirGScott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton-und.-Lyne)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John(Stoke-upon-Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Rt. Hn.E(Clackmann'n
Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, RtHnSirAlex.F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, RtHn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt.Hn.G(Winchester
Barrie, H.T.(Londonderry, N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cavendish, Rt.Hon.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Chamberlain, RtHn.J.A(Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gretton, John
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F.W.F.(BurySEdm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt.Hon.SirJohn H.
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hon.Col.W.
Keswick, William
King, SirHenrySeymour(Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Liddell, Henry
Long, Col.CharlesW(Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Nield, Herbert
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John FrederickPeel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A.Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley,Rt. Hon. C. B.Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Viscount Valentia and Lord Edmund Talbot.

Clause 13 :—

Amendment made—

"In page 6, line 18, at end, to add the words '(2) The annuity payable in respect of an advance made in pursuance of this section shall, in accordance with regulations made by the Treasury, be consolidated and made payable with the purchase annuity payable in respect of the purchase money of the parcel of land.'"—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Question put, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 315; Noes, 71, (Division List, No. 322).

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Berridge, T. H. D.
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Gr'st'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferens, T. R.
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davis, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael

Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)

Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)

Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Rt Hn E. (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reyneil
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G (Winchester)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd

Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F. W. F (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Liddell, Henry
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred

Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount

Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Forster.

Clause 14:—

Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 302; Noes, 71. (Division List, No. 323.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt Hn Richard Knight
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt Hon R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J (S. Pancras, W.)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, CH (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferens, T. R.
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henry, Charles S.
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Franci
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.

Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, F. (Notts., Bassetlaw)
Nicholson,Charles N(Doncaster
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien,Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson,SirW.D.(Colchester)
Pearson,W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps,Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh,Central)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell(Scarboro')
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts,John H. (Denbighsh.)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradford
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel,Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley,Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason,Rt Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson,J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir A.F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,RtHnA.J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring,Capt.Hn.G.(Winchester
Barrie,H.T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cavendish,Rt.Hon.Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Chamberlain,Rt Hn J.A(Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Forster, Henry William
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'd
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway,Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hn.Col.W.
Keswick, William
King,SirHenry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Liddell, Henry
Long, Col. Charles W.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E.C.
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John FrederickPeel
Roberts,S.(Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool,Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Thomson,W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Turnour, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Valentia and Lord Edmund Talbot.

Bill reported; as amended, to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 290.]

METROPOLITAN WATER BOARD (VARIOUS POWERS) BILL (BY ORDER).

As amended, considered.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) said that an arrangement had been come to that neither this Bill nor the Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, which was discussed last night, would be taken after the proceedings in Committee on the Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill had been disposed of. The hon. Member for Hammersmith had asked him to state that he left the precincts of the House on the distinct understanding that neither of these Bills would be taken. [AN HON. MEMBER: No.] Whether such an arrangement had been come to or not, he had at any rate carried out the undertaking he gave to the hon. Member. It was now a quarter past twelve o'clock, and he submitted that it was improper to take so important a Bill after a heavy Parliamentary day's work. He was not speaking without precedent, for it was only thirteen months since it was decided in the case of the Great Northern Railway of Ireland Bill that it was improper to proceed with the discussion of it after midnight. This Water Bill affected the interests of 6,000,000 people, and involved something like £40,000,000. The measure could not receive proper consideration in the early hours of the morning when hon. Members were fatigued by a long day's work. He begged to move the adjournment of the debate.

The Motion was not seconded.

MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam), in moving a new clause (for the protection of railway companies), expressed the hope that the House would not be alarmed at its length. It simply provided the protection which Parliament on all previous occasions of a like nature had granted to railway companies. He was glad to be able to inform the House that, subject to one Amendment, the promoters of the Bill had agreed to the new clause. It was proposed to amend Sub-clause (5) by inserting words which would have the effect of relieving the Metropolitan Water Board of the consequences of what might be called inevitable accident. For the rest, he knew perfectly well that he had to deal with any persons who dissented from the policy of the agreement arrived at, and who thought that the policy of the Joint Committee ought to be upheld. That made it necessary that he should to some extent explain the nature of the new clause. In connection with the water schemes of Birmingham, Liverpool and Manchester, it was necessary to construct works above or below the existing railways, and in all these cases a specific provision closely resembling the clause he now moved had been granted for the protection of the railway companies. The clause provided three requisites, namely, in the first place, that the works to be carried out should be executed under the supervision of the railway company's engineer after the submission to him of the necessary plans; secondly, that the traffic should not be interfered with; and thirdly, that if any damage resulted to the company's servants, or to the public, or to the company themselves in consequence of these works, compensation must be paid. What was the objection which was made? It was said that there were provisions under the Public Health Act of 1875 which gave the public authority power for sewer-laying purposes to enter upon the premises of anybody under the sidewalks of public highways. They were told that they ought to be satisfied with the pecuniary compensation which was set up under the Public Health Act, but he did not think they ought to be. That compensation was quite inappropriate to the present case, and moreover was given only in respect of Clause 61 of this Bill, and not at all in respect of the equally novel and even more dangerous proposals of Clause 58. He begged to move his Amendment in its amended form.

MR. CLAUDE HAY called attention to the fact that no one had seconded the Amendment.

*MR. SPEAKER said no seconder was required.

New clause—

"(1) In constructing laying down altering improving enlarging extending maintaining repairing renewing or removing any conduits mains pipes wires appliances apparatus or other works in exercise of any of the powers conferred by this Act or by any of the Acts incorporated wholly or partly therewith upon along across under or over the railways works lands or property of the railway companies or under over or across any level crossing over any such railway or under over across or in any way affecting the structure of any bridge or tunnel over or under such railways or the approaches to or roads over any such bridge or tunnel or any other road which the railway companies are or may be liable to maintain the same shall be done under the superintendence and to the reasonable satisfaction of the chief engineer of the railway company whose railways bridges tunnels works lands or other property or level crossing may be affected or by whom any such road is liable to be maintained (in this section called 'the engineer') and in accordance with plans specifications sections and detailed drawings (in this section referred to as 'the plans') previously submitted to and approved in writing by the engineer or in case of difference settled by arbitration in manner hereinafter provided. Provided that if the engineer shall not within twenty-eight days after the plans shall have been submitted for his approval notify to the Board in writing his disapproval thereof he shall be deemed to have approved the plans;

"(2) All such works shall be done by and at the expense of the Board who shall also make good and restore to the reasonable satisfaction of the engineer any property or works of the railway companies or any roads liable to be maintained by them affected by such works and shall to the like satisfaction maintain such roads (so far as the same may have been interfered with by the execution of such works) for three months after such restoration and for such further time (if any) not being more than twelve months in the whole as such roads shall continue to subside;

"(3) All such works and any matters incidental to or connected therewith shall be done and carried out by the Board at such times and in such manner as the engineer may reasonably direct and so as to cause as little injury as may be to the railways bridges tunnels works lands and property of the railway companies or to any road which such companies may be liable to maintain;

"(4) In the execution of any such works or incidental matters the Board shall not at any time or in any manner cause any injury or danger or (so far as can be avoided) any interruption impediment or delay to the safe passage and conduct of traffic over the railways or at to or from the stations sidings or works of the railway companies;

"(5) If any such injury danger interruption impediment or delay shall be caused by or be attributable to any of such works or incidental matters or by or to the acts or defaults of the Board or their officers servants contractors or workmen or any other person employed in connection with such works or by or to the failure of any such works (such injury danger interruption impediment or delay not being the result of inevitable accident) the Board shall indemnify and save harmless the railway companies from all and any claims and demands which may be made upon the railway companies in connection with such injury danger interruption impediment delay or failure and shall also make compensation to the railway companies in respect of any loss or injury which they may sustain or any expense to which they may be put in connection with any such injury danger interruption impediment delay or failure and the amount of such compensation shall in case of difference be settled by arbitration in the manner herinafter provided: Provided that in the case of the exercise by the Board of the powers of the section of this Act of which the marginal note is 'Power to Board to exercise powers of Local Authorities under Public Health Act 1875' this subsection shall apply instead of Section 308 of 'The Public Health Act 1875';

"(6) Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act or any Act incorporated wholly or partly therewith the Board shall not without the consent in writing of the railway companies under their common seal purchase or acquire any of the lands or property of the railway companies but the Board may acquire and the railway companies shall if required grant to the Board an easement or right of constructing and maintaining works on through in under over or along such lands and property and the sum to be paid for the acquisition of such easement or right shall be settled in the manner provided by 'The Lands Clauses Consolidation Act 1845' with respect to the purchase of lands otherwise than by agreement. Provided always that where the Board shall have acquired any such easement or right as aforesaid nothing in this Act shall prevent the Railway Companies from using their lands and property as they may think fit subject to such reasonable protection for the works of the Board as may be agreed or settled by arbitration in manner hereinafter provided;

"(7) The Board shall so construct maintain and work any wires and apparatus for the transmission of messages or reservoir level indications by means of electricity which they may establish under the powers of this Act as not to interfere with the working of any telephone telegraph train signalling or other apparatus of the railway companies by any stray currents induction or contacts and if any such interference shall take place the railway companies shall be at liberty to construct and provide an insulated return to the circuits affected by such interference or to do such other works as may be reasonably necessary and the Board shall on demand pay to the railway companies the reasonable cost of constructing and providing such insulated return or of such other necessary works as aforesaid;

"(8) The railway companies may if they so elect to do themselves carry out at the cost charges and expenses of the Board any works upon in under across or affecting their railways lands works or property except the provision of pipes and laying and jointing the same which shall be done by the Board;

"(9) If the railway companies at any time or times hereafter require (of which they shall be the sole judges) to adapt their railways or any part or parts thereof for working by electrical power or to construct any additional or other works upon their lands or railways or in connection therewith or to widen alter reconstruct or repair their railways bridges tunnels subways viaducts or works upon across over or under which any of the works of the Board may have been constructed or laid or if at any time or times hereafter a bridge shall be constructed in substitution for a level crossing upon across over or under which any of the works of the Board may have been constructed or laid the railway companies may on giving to the Board twenty-eight days' notice in writing under the hand of their secretary or general manager of their intention so to do and in case of emergency (of which the engineer shall be the sole judge) without notice at their own expense divert alter support or carry the said works of the Board across over or under their railways lands works or property at any other point doing as little damage as may be and without being liable to pay compensation in respect of such diversion alteration supporting or carrying such works. Provided always that such diversion or alteration shall be done without unduly interfering with the supply of water by the Board;

"(10) In the execution or alteration by the railway companies of any works of the Board under either of the two last preceding sub-sections the same shall be done under the superintendence and to the reasonable satisfaction of the engineer to the Board and in accordance with plans specifications sections and detailed drawings previously submitted to and approved in writing by the said engineer or in case of difference settled by arbitration in manner hereinafter provided and if the said engineer shall not within twenty-eight days after the said plans specifications sections and detailed drawings shall have been submitted for his approval notify to the railway companies in writing his disapproval of the same he shall be deemed to have approved thereof and the railway companies shall not at any time or in any manner cause any avoidable interruption in the supply of water by the Board and if any such interruption shall be caused by or be attributable to the works of the railway companies or to the acts or defaults of such companies or their officers servants contractors or workmen or any other person employed in connection with such works or from the failure of any such works the railway companies shall indemnify and save harmless the Board from all and any claims and demands which may be made upon the Board in connection with such interruption and shall also make compensation to the Board in respect of any loss or injury which they may sustain or any expense to which they may be put in connection with such interruption and the amount of such compensation shall in case of difference be settled by arbitration in the manner hereinafter provided;

"(11) If having regard to the proposed position of any work to be executed by the Board in relation to the position of the works of the railway companies at any point where the works of the Board will be constructed over under or along any railways or works of the railway companies it becomes reasonably necessary that any of the works of the railway companies should be altered the railway companies may execute the works reasonably necessary for such alteration and the reasonable costs of executing such works shall be repaid by the Board to the railway companies;

"(12) Nothing in this Act contained shall enable the Board to raise sink remove or otherwise alter the position of any railway sidings embankments bridges tunnels stations and works of a similar character belonging to the railway companies;

"(13) If by reason of the execution of any of the works of the Board it shall become necessary to reconstruct alter strengthen or in anywise interfere with the structure of any bridge tunnel or other work of the railway companies such alteration reconstruction or strengthening shall be carried out by the railway companies at such times and in such manner as they may reasonably think expedient or necessary and the reasonable cost thereof shall be borne by the Board;

"(14) The Board shall bear and on demand pay to the railway companies affected by the construction laying down alteration improvement enlargement extension maintenance renewal or removal of or the execution of repairs to any works of the Board all reasonable costs of the superintendence by the railway companies of the said works and repairs and of watching lighting and protection of the railways and works of the railway companies with reference to and during such works or repairs but such superintendence shall not relieve the Board from liability for any accidents which may be occasioned by or through any act or default of the Board or any contractors agent or workman or other person or persons employed in or about the execution and carrying out of such works or repairs;

"(15) Any dispute or difference which may arise between the railway companies and the Board with reference to the provisions of this section or in any way arising thereout or as to any works to be carried out by the Board or by the railway companies shall be settled by arbitration by an engineer or other fit person to be agreed upon between them or failing such agreement to be appointed by the President of the Institution of Civil Engineers on the application of the railway companies and the Board or either of them."

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this clause be read a second time."

*MR. LUKE WHITE (Yorkshire, E.R., Buckrose) as a member of the Joint Committee said that they took evidence on behalf of the railway companies and against them, and heard counsel for and against the Bill. It was not a measure establishing for the first time a waterwork undertaking, but was simply to carry out certain works and make provision with regard to the many powers which were given to the Water Board. There were ten members of the Committee present when the decision was arrived at, and they were unanimous in coming to the conclusion that this clause should not be allowed. In coming to that conclusion, and in considering the evidence produced by the railway companies, no statement was made of any difficulty which had arisen in London with regard to the present powers possessed by the railway companies with regard to the waterworks of the companies or the Water Board, and of course, one, that night, was placed in a somewhat difficult position. With some experience of Private Bill Committees he might say that he was not one of those who thought that because some agreement was made under pressure and for the purpose of getting a Bill through the House, the agreement was binding on the House of Commons, and that they should in any way sacrifice the large community whose interests they were concerned to look after. He asked the House of Commons to support the Committee in the decision which they came to after hearing the evidence and all the arguments of counsel. The Committee had decided that the clause should not be inserted in the Bill, and of course, it was for the House of Commons to say whether it should be inserted or not. There were no new facts brought forward in the House other than those which came before the Committee, and the Committee had the advantage of hearing all the evidence and the arguments which could be advanced.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs) said that, before the debate closed, he wished to say a few words on behalf of the Board of Trade. Of course the Board of Trade had looked at this matter purely from the point of view of the public interest, which was involved in the proposal. He was informed that an arrangement had been arrived at between the parties concerned which involved a very considerable modification of the clause on the Paper. It was an arrangement, in fact, which altered the original proposals in one very material respect. He need hardly say that the Board of Trade had gone into the matter very carefully. Having considered the evidence given before the Committee, and also the point as it was put by the hon. Member who had just spoken, he thought the clause in its altered form was a perfectly fair one. What, after all, did it involve? He was not reflecting on the Committee or suggesting for one moment that on the evidence before them they should not have come to the decision they did; but in one respect he believed they took too favourable a view of the clause in the Public Health Act to which his hon. friend had alluded. He was informed by the legal advisers of his Department that this clause in the Public Health Act did not cover all the points which might be raised under the conditions created by this Bill. It was their opinion that it would be necessary for the legitimate protection of the railway companies that some provision in the nature of the clause now submitted by the right hon. Gentlemen the Member for Sheffield, should be inserted in the Bill. All they had to ensure was that fair play was done by the Department. What, then, was the position? Here they had a railway company on a bridge across a river which they had erected at an enormous expense. The Water Board came and asked for an easement to enable them to use that bridge for the purpose of carrying a pipe main across the river. All the railway company asked was this: If anything happened to the bridge in consequence, say, of the pipes bursting, the damage would be made good by the water company. The House should bear in mind that in such a case the damage could not in any sense be said to be due to any fault of the railway company, and if the damage arose from the fact of the pipes having been laid there it seemed to him to be perfectly fair that the water company should bear the brunt of it. That was the proposition as laid down in the clause on the Order Paper, but the modification which had been agreed to by the railway companies gave away even that proposition, and it was, he believed, only in very exceptional cases that this would apply at all. He could understand that the House was naturally anxious to support the decisions of a Committee, but after all the House of Commons could not altogether part with the power of supervising the actions even of its Committees, otherwise there would be no object whatever in bringing a Bill back to the House for consideration on report. However much disposed the House of Commons might be to support the decision of a Committee which had undoubtedly taken a great deal of trouble in considering the questions raised by the Bill, he hoped that when a matter of this kind came forward the House would see that fair play and justice was done as between the parties. The officials of the Board of Trade had examined into the matter quite impartially. They had seen both parties. They had heard what the Metropolitan Water Board had to say and also what the railway companies had to say. He understood that as the result of conferences which had taken place the Water Board had agreed to the modified form of clause which was now proposed. When the parties had considered the matter fairly and had come to the conclusion that they could safely accept the clause in its modified form he did not think the members of the Committee would go to the extent of pressing their opposition to it. The parties having come to that agreement, he did not see what possible injustice there could be to the great community referred to by his hon. friend. That community, he was sure, only wanted to do what was fair, either in London or elsewhere, and if through any accident to water pipes any injury or damage was done to a railway bridge put up at a great expense it was only fair that that expense should be borne by the water company which was responsible for laying down the mains. He trusted that the House of Commons would accept the clause in its modified form. He thought that, on the whole, it was fair as between the parties. There was nothing very sweeping or drastic in it, and there was nothing in it which the House of Commons need have any fear about if they passed it.

MR. CLEMENT EDWARDS (Denbigh District) expressed a profound hope that in spite of what the right hon. Gentleman had said the House of Commons would reject what he ventured to criticise as an impudent attempt on the part of the railway companies to secure preferential treatment of an unusual kind. What the right hon. Gentleman had said as regarded the fair treatment of a railway company in respect of a bridge might equally be said of the London County Council in regard to its tramways system. It might also be said of a canal company, where canals and locks interfered with the particular work of another big company, and of almost any other concern. What was asked for here was a special and distinct preferential position for the railway companies. The right hon. Gentleman had suggested that because the representatives of the railway companies on the one side and the representatives of the Metropolitan Water Board on the other, had, under the pressure of Parliamentary circumstances, come to an agreement, the matter was at an end. But there was also to be considered the large and important interest of the community that was represented neither by the railway companies on the one side nor even by the Metropolitan Water Board on the other. For that interest they, as Members of the House of Commons, were the trustees. He ventured to say that they would not be discharging the sacred trust which was imposed upon them if they did not look with a careful, jealous, and scrutinising eye upon the proposals now before the House. The moment the proposals were carefully scrutinised it was seen that the railway companies were asking for a kind of treatment at the hands of Parliament in regard to this matter, totally different from that which had been sanctioned in the case of other undertakings. The Committee by whom this matter had been dealt with, had very carefully considered all interests. They had the proposal of the railway companies before them and they thrashed it out with the advantage of the evidence of expert witnesses to guide them. He asked the House to adopt the view that the Committee, who had heard all the arguments on both sides, came to a perfectly right decision in the matter, and he hoped the House would uphold the Committee by rejecting the proposal to insert this extraordinary new clause.

MR. C. DUNCAN (Barrow-in-Furness) said that as one of those Members who sat on the Committee for no less than thirteen days and listened to all the statements and arguments brought forward by the officials of the railway companies, as well as by the counsel whom they employed, he thought the case was put as fairly and as fully as one could expect before a Committee of that description. It appeared to him that what the railway companies were aiming at was that they should stand first and that the Water Board, representing the supply of water to 6,000,000 of people, should come second. He would be very much surprised if a House of Commons, composed as the present House was, accepted and agreed to a proposition of that kind. They were legislating that night for the supply of water to the biggest city in the world, and it seemed to him, after the difficulties that had been experienced in the Metropolis in the past, that the least the House could do was to give the water authority complete control so that it might take its pipes and works over obstructions. Those works were essential for the supply of water to the people, and the railway companies should not be allowed to dictate terms to the Water Board as they had done in the past. One case which was cited before the Committee struck him as being very important indeed. The position was this: A line of pipes was to be taken over a railway bridge. The said railway bridge passed over a public road. The railway company had got permission to put their bridge over the public road at their own expense, but paying nothing to the public who made the road. When the line of pipes was put over the bridge a nominal rent was fixed for the accommodation; but afterwards the railway company arbitrarily raised the rent charged from a very insignificant figure to a sum of about £38 per annum. That was some evidence of the fact that it was not exactly wise to place a public authority under the hands of either a railway or of any other company. It seemed to him that the public requirements, especially in the case of an essential article like water, should stand first all the time, and for that reason he should vote against any Amendment that it might be proposed to make in the Bill with the object of serving other interests than those of the general community. All these questions were argued very fully before the Committee, who examined special witnesses and had every matter bearing on the subject most carefully explained. Instead of sanctioning the arrangement which had been referred to, and of which he was beginning to grow suspicious, as it had been made behind the scenes, the House of Commons, if it did its duty as it ought to do it, would say that the House itself was the place where any arrangement ought to be made. Objecting as he did to the arrangement, he hoped the House would reject the Amendment and put the Water Board in a proper position.

SIR J. RANDLES (Cumberland, Cockermouth) said that in considering the question the Committee looked first and foremost at the public interest. He thought perhaps it would be going too far to say that because they had decided a matter in a certain way in Committee they should not review the case when it came back to the House of Commons. The chief reason that influenced him in the opinion he gave in the Committee was that he wanted the Water Board to have sufficient facilities and powers for dealing with matters which the Committee thought were in the interest of the public. If the Water Board in their discretion conceived that they could by coming to an arrangement with the railway companies further the interests of the Bill and secure its passage, he, not being unduly suspicious, did not think the members of the Committee need take up a *non possumus* attitude or be too sensitive about their decision in Committee on a point of this kind. He was inclined to think that if the Board of Trade in their guardianship of the public interest, and the Metropolitan Water Board in pursuit of the same interest, came together in such a matter as that now under discussion, the

House might reasonably agree to the modified proposal which had been submitted.

*Mr. DICKINSON (St. Pancras, N.) said that those Members of the House who sat through the small hours of yesterday morning would realise the rather difficult position in which they found themselves. They were then admonished by a member of the Government that they ought not to go behind the decision of the Committee. Now they were advised by another member of the Government that they ought to overthrow the decision of the Committee. He did not differ with the President of the Board of Trade. He certainly held that they were quite entitled to go behind the decision of the Committee. But at the same time, it was surely a matter which must be fairly argued on the floor of that House, and he could not help thinking that they had not had very strong arguments in favour of the Amendment. Let them just see what the Amendment was. He did not proposed to read it all through, but he proposed to ask the attention of the House to the words in Subsection 5—

> "If any such injury, danger, or any interruption, impediment, or delay, shall be caused by or attributable to any of such works o· incidental matters or to the acts or defaults of the Board, or their officers, servants, contractors or workmen, or any other person employed in connection with such works, or from the failure of any such works, the Board shall indemnify and save harmless the railway companies from all and any claims and demands which may be made upon the railway companies in connection with such injury, danger, interruption, impediment, delay or failure, and shall also make compensation to the railway companies in respect of any loss or injury which they may sustain or any expense to which they may be put in connection with any such injury, danger, interruption, impediment, delay, or failure, and the amount of such compensation shall, in case of difference, be settled by arbitration."

*Mr. LUKE WHITE: The hon. Gentleman has not got the amended clause.

*Mr. DICKINSON, consulting the amended clause, said it provided that unless in the case of inevitable accident in connection with injury, danger, interruption, impediment, or delay to the works the Board should indemnify and save harmless the railway companies. The House had only to look at the clause to see what an endless vista of responsibility might be placed upon the public authority and what an amount of litigation might arise. What was the position of the public authority? The public authority, as they were told by the document which had been circulated to them on behalf of the Metropolitan Board, was the statutory authority which, under the general law of the land, would have no responsibility unless any damage were due to their own negligence. In other words the effect of the clause would be to reduce the Board to the position in which they would be if they executed the proposed works without the authority of Parliament. That was to say, the treatment which was given to all public authorities constituted by Parliament was to be denied to this one in favour of certain railway companies. The proposal was of enormous magnitude, and if it was of enormous magnitude surely it ought not to come before the House unless with the approval of the Committee. They had no right to put such a burden upon the public authority unless they had had the matter investigated and approved by the Committee. They were placed in this peculiar position by the method adopted of sending Bills to Joint Committees. If the Bill had gone through the ordinary course it would have proceeded to a Committee of the Lords and there would have been another opportunity of investigating these proposals. But as matters stood their only appearance now was on the floor of this House. He ventured to hope that in the interests of the public of London the House would not assent to the Amendment, notwithstanding the fact that they were told the Metropolitan Board of Water had agreed to it. He must say he could not read the document circulated without marvelling as to how and why the Board had come to agree to these proposals. They had not had the advantage of hearing the representative of the Board upon that question. Seeing the Amendments had been down on the Paper for some days or weeks, and that they had been always under the impression that they were Amendments opposed by the promoters of the Bill, now that, at the last moment, they found they had been agreed to, the House should pause before acceding to the request made by the President of the Board of Trade.

*COLONEL R. WILLIAMS (Dorsetshire, W.) said there was one point in his speech where the hon. Member seemed to be rather thankful there was a House of Lords. He wanted to say a word or two as to the gist of his speech about the public authority. He thought the hon. Gentleman had forgotten that railway companies were statutory authorities working under Act of Parliament just as much as the Metropolitan Board of Water. Hon. Gentlemen spoke of the Water Board dealing with a population of 6,000,000. Did they remember the number of the millions who travelled habitually in and out of London on the railways, and of whose safety the railway companies had charge? There was a possibility that the companies might be put to very serious inconvenience through delay to the trains by the Water Board, if the Water Board or anybody else had unlimited access. Yet not one word had been said of that much larger population who used the railways and whose interests the railways had to protect. There was the case of a railway company making a bridge over which the water company desired to carry pipes. Supposing that bridge was not quite sufficiently strong to carry those pipes, was it seriously contended that the water company would have the right to enter and weaken the bridge to a dangerous point in order to carry their water pipes over? Was it contended it was not perfectly right that the water company should pay £30 or £40 a year for the privilege of carrying their pipes over, instead of having to build a new bridge and spend £5,000 or £10,000 of money. He was sure the water company could not grumble at that. Supposing it was not a railway company at all, supposing it was a private bridge, as they sometimes had, would it be seriously contended if the water company laid pipes across and an accident occurred because of those pipes the water company would not have to pay for it? The hon. Member for Denbigh District had spoken of an arrangement being approved by the President of the Board of Trade. He forgot to put in the words "fair and just," upon which the President of the Board of Trade based his approval.

MR. CLEMENT EDWARDS interposed to say that what he said was that if the arrangement was just in the case of a railway company it was equally just in the case of a county council or a canal company, and that these were given no such preferential treatment.

*COLONEL R. WILLIAMS said that was not the portion of the speech to which he was referring. It would be absurd to think that in the case where the bridge belonged to a private person the water company would not pay. Not a word had been said as regarded the question of delay to trains. He should have thought it was a sufficiently common experience—it was obtained by almost every public purveyor of transportation, a railway company or anybody else—that there should be a stipulation that if the company was put to any expense by the act of somebody else whom it had obliged, a corporation or whatever it might be, the company was to be recouped by that person or corporation and was not to bear the expense. That was perfectly fair and reasonable.

*MR. LUKE WHITE said the company could be recouped under the general law.

*COLONEL R. WILLIAMS said they were told by the President of the Board of Trade and his legal advisers that the company could not be recouped under the clause. If the clause was fair and reasonable he could not see why the House should not carry it out. It did not matter whether it was a water company or a railway company or not. It did not matter what they called the two parties. If the House desired to do what was fair and just let them remember that it was not the interests of one particular section against another, but the interests as a whole of the water consumers and of the great population that used the railways.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that if he were clear that the general law would afford the protection his hon. friend had said he would not have intervened in the matter. It was because he was advised the general law did not afford that protection that he took the course he did.

*Mr. HELME (Lancashire, Lancaster) said the general law under the Public Health Acts would give the railway companies all the protection they required. The Public Health Act of 1875 provided that—

> "Where any person sustains any damage by reason of the exercise of any of the powers of this Act in relation to any matter as to which he is not himself in default full compensation shall be made to such person by the local authority exercising such power."

They had that night to face a very important decision, one which had far-reaching effects and which might apply to a great many public authorities beyond the Water Board in question. The course of private Bill business in that House was entrusted to Committees, and the greatest consideration should be given by the House before it consented to reverse the decision of a Committee, which had sent down a Bill after careful consideration. He held that in dealing that night with this proposal there had been no case made out by the right hon. Gentleman on which they ought for one moment to upset the decision of the Committee upstairs. The case was one in which, owing to the exigencies of the Parliamentary session, there had been an arrangement arrived at between the two parties rather than that the promoters should lose the Bill, and it was for the House to say whether it was wise for it to depart from the usual custom when there had been no case made out for the proposal which was then before them. He submitted that in dealing with Private Bill legislation they ought to stand by the statute law and not allow an exception to be made in that case. No cause had been shown why the Amendment should be considered to be necessary. The railway company would not suffer if it were not inserted. Enormous powers were dealt with in the several sections of the new clause. The railway company might come down with its engineers and direct certain work to be done. The great municipalities throughout the country might be subjected to powers similar to those now sought, if they granted the same to the railway company. Those municipalities were continually seeking such powers, by Private Bills or otherwise, for the purpose of carrying out great sewage, water, and general works. The railway company was an all-powerful authority, and Parliament, naturally, must have regard to the limitation of the interests of railway companies when they come in conflict with the public interest. He held that if the House that night consented to upset the finding of the Committee they would be striking a blow at the public interest by allowing the railway company to come down and reverse the decision of the Joint Committee in order to give the railway company such special powers. They ought to be very careful not to upset their whole system of Private Bill legislation, as it would be upset if the Amendment were accepted that night. The President of the Board of Trade had looked into the matter and consented up to a certain limit, but the right hon. Gentleman's point had been that the Board of Trade need not interfere because an agreement had been arrived at by the parties concerned. He believed that in the circumstances under which the agreement had been come to the House was justified in doing all that it could to prevent its being accepted.

Viscount TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham) said that in the Amendment there were questions raised which were more important than the Bill itself. They had to decide whether the Bill should be judged on its merits or on socialistic theories. The President of the Board of Trade had given very concisely and very fairly his reasons why the House should accept the Amendment. He had listened to the speeches of the opponents of the new clause, but he had heard nothing to upset any single part of the right hon. Gentleman's speech. The hon. Member for Denbigh had said that the public interest would be prejudicially affected by the Bill. That was an extraordinary statement, and neither the hon. Member nor any of his friends had brought forward any reason in support of it. He did not think it was right that the clause should be allowed to pass without a protest from that side of the House against wild statements of that kind being made against the two parties to the agreement. The hon. Member who had spoken from below the gangway on his own side of the House had said that he was unduly suspicious about the arrangement. He agreed with the hon. Member he was unduly suspicious. He thought it was very unfortunate that when two parties, containing on their boards men of the highest commercial ability, agreed to a clause of that kind, which was accepted by the Government, and therefore by the experts of the Board of Trade, hon. Gentlemen below the gangway on both sides of the House should ask the House to reject the clause on the ground that its acceptance would be prejudicial to the public interest, without giving any reasons in support of this statement. He only rose for the purpose of protesting against the statements made by hon. Members on both sides of the House, and having made that protest he appealed to the House to accept the new clause.

SIR **EDWIN CORNWALL** (Bethnal Green, N.E.) said that when he saw the Amendment for the first time on the Paper and knew that the Joint Committee had decided against it, it was his intention strongly to oppose its insertion in the Bill, but he felt that the House was bound to have regard to what had happened since. It seemed to him that it would be unwise not to have regard to the special circumstances of the case. He had listened to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment and who informed the House that the promoters had accepted it. He had ascertained since that the promoters had agreed to the Amendment because they desired to get the Bill through as quickly as possible, in order that they might get on with other Bills. When the promoters of a Bill accepted Amendments even for that reason there could not be so much in the Amendments to lead that House to set aside the agreement which had been come to, especially in view of the latest circumstances. The President of the Board of Trade, acting on behalf of the Government, after seeing both parties, and hearing what both the promoters of the Bill and those who wanted the Amendment had to say, had advised the House that the clause was not an unfair one. In view of the circumstances they would be straining their principles too far if they did not accept the situation. The hon. Member for Lancaster had spoken in regard to municipal authorities and clauses of the nature they were considering. His experience of Bills promoted by local authorities had been that it was very seldom that a local authority promoted a Bill without a railway company getting some protective clause inserted. He had seen many clauses in Bills promoted by the London County Council and other authorities which had been added after the Bills were introduced, and when he had asked what those clauses were for, he had been told that they were protective clauses for railway companies. When a railway company was promoting a Bill he supposed the Water Board would come along and want protective clauses against the railway company. It was the business of the House fairly to consider a matter of that kind, and he contended that they had given it consideration. When the President of the Board of Trade on the advice of his expert officers had supported the Amendment, and the promoters of the Bill had agreed to it—it might have been from Parliamentary pressure—the House ought to accept it. The Amendment could not be of vital importance to the promoters of the Bill; otherwise they would have had no right to accept it. The point that weighed with him, however, was that the agreement had been arrived at in conjunction with the responsible Government authority, who would not have taken the responsibility of asking the House to agree to an Amendment of that character if it were contrary to Parliamentary precedent. He hoped that they would not by delaying the passing of the Bill entitle people to describe them as being unreasonable.

MR. **WATERLOW** (Islington, N.) said he had only one short point to raise. The railway companies and that particular Water Board had been working side by side for many years without the special powers, and he had heard nothing whatever which would justify the special powers being given in that hurry and at that late hour of the night. He was prepared to oppose the Amendment.

MR. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire) thought it should be understood that there would be no reflection whatever cast on the decision of the Committee if the House chose to accept the Amendment. If the proposal agreed to by the two parties had been made when the Bill was before the Committee the Committee would probably have accepted it at once in order to get on with other business. It seemed to him that it was perfectly in order that if an agreement could be arrived at by the parties concerned the House should agree to it. He hoped it would be clearly understood that those who voted as he proposed to do for the proposals of the right hon. Gentleman did so without casting any reflection at all on the Committee, but simply because the parties concerned had arrived at an agreement.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 61; Noes, 44. (Division List No. 324.)

AYES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beck, A. Cecil
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Forster, Henry William
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gladstone,Rt. Hn.HerbertJohn
Haworth, Arthur A.
Henry, Charles S.
Hervey,F.W.F. (Bury S.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement(Shrewsbury)
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holt, Richard Durning
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hunt, Rowland
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennaway,Rt.Hon SirJohn H.
Keswick, William
Lamont, Norman
Law, Andrew Bonar(Dulwich)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lupton, Arnold
Maclean, Donald
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.)
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morpeth, Viscount
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Rea, Walter Russell(Scarboro')
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roberts,S.(Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Thomson,W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Turnour, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Stuart - Wortley and Mr. Ainsworth.

NOES.

Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Braing,Godfrey(Isle of Wight)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bowerman, C. W.
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Clough, William
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,CH (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Gill, A. H.
Goddard. Daniel Ford
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hedges, A. Paget
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Joyce, Michael
Kelley, George D.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macpherson, J. T.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
O'Grady, J.
O'Shee, James John
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Radford, G. H.
Richardson, A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Toulmin, George
Waterlow, D. S.
Whitbread, Howard
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W.(Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Dickinson and Mr. Helme.

*DR. RUTHERFORD said that he desired to move a new clause for the benefit and protection of the Heston and Isleworth and Twickenham Urban District Councils.

Mr. Waterlow.

He regretted that at that hour of the night it was impossible to do justice to the clause. He wanted to be merciful to the House, and he would not go very fully into the details. But, without going into all the sections, he felt that there were two or three points which he might briefly mention. In the first place, the district councils of Heston, Isleworth and Twickenham asked for twenty-one days notice from the Water Board when any new mains were to be laid in their respective districts. They also asked that plans and sections of the works contemplated should be supplied to them. This was not provided for in the Waterworks Clauses Act, 1847, and he thought it was a simple request for the public authorities in question to make, more especially as there were as many as eight mains in some roads. Then the district councils asked that if any damage was done by the Board to the surface of the streets the Board should be responsible for it, and should make it good. They further asked that all pipes should be laid at least two feet below the surface of the roads. This was a very necessary provision, because he regretted to say that in some of the streets of Twickenham the collars of the pipes were to be seen projecting above the surface of the ground, and these of course, were a positive danger as well as an eyesore. The presence of the clause in the Bill would be of service to the public in the districts referred to in many ways. At present public traffic was stopped when pipes were being laid by the Water Board, and in some cases the stoppages had been for as long as six months. That was a very serious matter, and all that the local authorities asked was that only one-half the width of the street should be taken up, and 100 yards dealt with at one time. He would not go into the other subsections of the clause, but would simply point out to the House that they were very simple and very reasonable terms. He knew that the clause had been considered by the Committee upstairs, but the same might be said of the Water Board (Charges) Bill, in the case of which it was well known that very satisfactory concessions were made after the measure had been sent back to the House. He appealed to the President of the Local Government Board to give the proposed clause his favourable consideration, and he hoped that it would be agreed to by the House, being confident that it contained only the most reasonable terms.

MR. CLAUDE HAY seconded the clause.

New Clause—"For the benefit and protection of the Heston and Isleworth and Twickenham Urban District Councils (in this section called or referred to as 'the Urban District Councils'), the following provisions shall, notwithstanding anything in this Act contained or shown on the deposited plans and sections, unless otherwise agreed to in writing between the councils and the Board, have effect (that is to say):—(*a*) The Board shall not commence any of the said works to be executed by them so far as they affect any of the roads, footpaths, ways, sewers, drains, surface-water culverts, and water-courses belonging to or under the control of either of the said urban district councils until they shall have given to such urban district council at least twenty-one days' notice in writing of their intention to commence the same, by leaving the notice at the office for the time being of the clerk to such urban district council, with plans and sections of the said works, nor until such urban district council shall have signified its approval of the same, unless the said urban district council shall fail to signify in writing to the Board its approval or disapproval within twenty-one days after service of the said notice and delivery of the said plans and sections, in which event the Board may proceed forthwith with the said works in accordance with the said plans and sections, and in case, after such disapproval has been signified as aforesaid, any such plans and sections are not agreed upon, any difference between the Board and the said urban district council or councils with reference to the matters aforesaid shall be determined by arbitration as hereinafter provided; (*b*) Where the surface of any street or footpath or public place has been interfered with or disturbed by the Board in constructing the work or performing the operations by this Act authorised, the Board shall forthwith well and sufficiently, and to the reasonable satisfaction of such urban district council having control of the same, or its surveyor, restore the surfaces so interfered with or disturbed, and shall make good and repair for one year from any such restoration any sinking or subsidence of such street or footpaths caused by the execution of the said works; (*c*) No part of the works by this Act authorised shall unnecessarily interfere with the sewers, drains, or watercourses of or under the control of either of the urban district councils, and shall be so constructed that the upper surface of the conduits, mains, or lines of pipes shall throughout the entire length where they respectively pass through the lands, roads, or ways of such urban district council be not less than two feet below the present surface of the ground; (*d*) The Board shall not without the consent of the urban district council having the control and management of any street referred to in Section 14 of this Act in any way during the progress of the works by this Act authorised stop, or impede, or obstruct the public traffic passing along more than one-half the width of any such street for a greater length than 100 yards at one time, and shall in the execution of such works comply with and conform to all reasonable directions and regulations of any such urban district council in reference to such interference with the said street, footpaths, or public places and the traffic; (*e*) No sewer, drain, gas, or other main or pipe of or under the control of either of the urban district councils shall be raised, sunk, or otherwise altered in position so as to impair the efficiency of such sewer, drain, gas, or other main or pipe, or of any existing connection therewith, or so as to interfere with or increase the cost of any connection which may hereafter require to be made to such sewer, drain, gas, or other main or pipe by the owners or occupiers of any lands or premises in the district of either of such urban district councils; (*f*) The Board shall from time to time and within six months from the time at which any new conduits mains, or lines of pipes authorised by this Act shall have been laid down or formed by the Board within the district of any urban district council cause a map or plan to be made on a scale not more than 88 feet to the inch, and shall cause to be marked thereon the course and situation of such conduits, mains, or lines of pipes within the respective urban district council's district, and shall within six months from the making of any alterations or additions cause such map or plan to be from time to time corrected and such additions made thereto as may show the altered line and situation of such conduits, mains, or lines of pipes, and a copy of such map or plan with the date expressed thereon of the last time when the same shall have been so corrected as aforesaid shall be deposited at the offices of the respective urban district councils within one month from the making of such map or plan or any additions, alterations, or deviations; (*g*) Nothing in this Act shall take away or abridge any powers to open or break up any road along or across which any aqueducts, conduits, or lines of pipes for conveying water are laid, or any other power vested in any such urban district council for any of the purposes for which such urban district councils are respectively constituted, for the purpose of laying down, repairing, altering, or removing any pipes, drains, or sewers, or any tubes, wires, or apparatus for electric lighting, telegraphic, or other purposes, but in the exercise of such power every such urban district council shall be subject to the following restrictions (that is to say):—(1) They shall cause as little detriment or inconvenience to the Board as circumstances admit; (2) Before they commence any work whereby the flow of water along any aqueduct, conduit, or lines of pipes will be interrupted they shall (except in cases of urgency, in which cases no notice shall be necessary) give to the Board notice of their intention to commence such work, specifying the time at which they will begin to do so, such notice to be given seven days at least before the commencement of the work; (3) They shall not be liable to pay to the Board any compensation for injury done to the aqueducts, conduits, or lines of pipes for conveying water by the execution of such work, or for the reasonable exercise of the powers so vested in them as aforesaid; (4) Whenever, for the purpose of enabling them to execute such work, either of the urban district councils shall so require, the Board shall either stop the flow of water along the aqueduct, conduit, or lines of pipes to which the notice shall refer, where it would otherwise interfere with such work, or shore up and secure the same at their own risk and cost during the execution of the work there: Provided that such work shall always be completed by the urban district councils, or either of them, with all reasonable expedition; (5) Neither of the urban district councils shall execute such work, so far as it immediately affects the aqueducts, conduits, or lines of pipes, except under the superintendence of the Board, unless they refuse or neglect to give such superintendence at the time specified in the notice for the commencement of the work, or discontinue the same during the progress of the work, and they shall execute such work at their own expense and to the reasonable satisfaction of the Board: Provided that any additionol expense imposed upon any urban district council by reason of the existence of the aqueducts conduits, or lines of pipes in any road or place where any such pipes, drains or sewers, tubes, wires, or apparatus shall have been laid before the construction of such aqueducts, conduits, or lines of pipes for conveying water shall be borne by the Board.'"

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

*MR. LUKE WHITE said that this clause was brought before the Joint Committee along with a similar clause brought forward by other district councils. After hearing evidence on the point and considering the whole matter the Joint Committee came to the conclusion that the Twickenham Council, as well as other councils, were amply protected by the Waterworks Clauses Act, and accordingly they disallowed the clause. It was very significant that from the entire area of the Water Board there should be only one local authority asking for these special powers.

DR. RUTHERFORD: Three.

*MR. LUKE WHITE, said that the special clause was asked for on account of so many mains being laid in the roads or streets. He should have thought that if any local authority within the area of the Metropolitan Water Board required such a clause as this it would be the City of London, but, as a matter of fact, none of the other authorities required it. All the authorities throughout the area were protected by the Waterworks Clauses Act, and he asked the House to support the Committee in disallowing the clause.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I say ditto to the hon. Member who has just sat down and I hope the House will say the same.

DR. RUTHERFORD said that as the feeling of the House seemed to be against him on the subject he saw no reason why he should press the clause to a division.

Motion and clause, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 22, lines 11 and 12, to leave out the words 'of water supply,' and to insert the words 'from which the Board are for the time being authorised to take water.'"

"In page 22, line 12, after the word 'their,' to insert the word 'authorised.'"

Amendments agreed to—

*MR. WILLIAM KESWICK moved to leave out Clause 36. He said that his Motion was made to express the feeling of a number of his constituents who were not satisfied with the site selected. The urban councils of East and West Molesey and Walton-on-Thames were opposed to the proposed site at Molesey. The locality was not adapted for the construction of a reservoir. It was too late in the night to enter into all the points which might be brought forward, but he earnestly hoped a promise might be given that a clause would be inserted by which the protection of the property of the people in East Molesey would be safe-guarded.

MR. CLAUDE HAY thought he might say the point raised by his hon. friend had never been considered by the Committee, which dealt with the subject in a general way. It was desired to retain under this clause certain powers conferred by the London Waterworks Act of 1900. Those powers were confined to London and specially to the locality of Lambeth. Now it was sought by the clause to give the powers which were originally given to Lambeth to the whole of London, which would make the local circumstances of East Molesey intolerable. Even the technical advisers of the Water Board said that the reservoir which would be created under this clause would be totally inadequate, they being of opinion, he was sure, that both money would be saved and local feeling better consulted by making the reservoir at another point. It seemed to him the House should delete that clause because it did not form part of the general framework of the Bill, but was merely a clause swept in under the general powers which were being given over to the Water Board.

Amendment proposed :—" To leave out Clause 36."

*MR. LUKE WHITE said it was a misapprehension that the Joint Committee did not consider the matter. The Joint Committee not only heard counsel with regard to this particular point, but they heard a great many witnesses with regard to the reservoir, to which they gave special attention. They considered most carefully the evidence brought before them, and came to the unanimous conclusion that in view of the action of Parliament in 1900, in connection with the reservoir, the Water Board should have the extension of time that was necessary in the interests of the water supply of London. He asked the House to affirm the decision of the Committee. It was absolutely necessary that the powers of the clause should be given. The Committee went into all the details and no harm could be done to anyone.

Question, proposed, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill,"

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill to be read the third time.

PUBLIC HEALTH BILL.

Order for consideration, as amended (by the Standing Committee), read.

Motion made, and Question, " That the Bill be re-committed to the former Committee,"—(*Mr. Harmood-Banner*), —put, and agreed to.

And, it being after half-past Eleven of the clock on Wednesday evening, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Two o'clock.

[APPENDICES.

APPENDIX I.

PUBLIC BILLS

DEALT WITH IN VOLUME CLXXVIII.

Those marked thus * are Government Bills. The figures in parentheses in the last column refer to the page in this volume. "[H.L.]" following title indicates that the Bill originated in the House of Lords.

(A.) HOUSE OF LORDS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Advertisements Regulation	*Lord Balfour of Burleigh*	Committee 11th July (23) Report 17th July (660) Read 3^a and passed 23rd July (1284)
*British North America	*Earl of Elgin*	Committee 15th July (466) Report 17th July (660) Read 3^a and passed 18th July (892)
Companies Consolidation [H.L.]	*Earl Granard*	Read 1^a 18th July (810) Read 2^a 23rd July (1284)
*Imported Watch Cases	*Earl Granard*	Read 2^a 15th July (267) Committee 16th July (473)
Injured Animals Act (1894) Amendments	*Lord Aberdare*	Read 2^a 18th July (810) Committee } 22nd July (1123) Report } Read 3^a and passed 23rd July (1309)
Lights on Vehicles		Read 1^a 15th July (264)
Limited Partnership [H.L.]	*Lord Avebury*	Report 16th July (469) Read 3^a and passed 18th July (892)
Petty Sessions Clerks (Ireland)	*Earl of Mayo*	Read 1^a 17th July (651)
*Post Office Sites		Read 1^a 22nd July (1083)
*Public Health (Scotland) Amendment [H.L.]	*Lord Hamilton of Dalzell*	Read 1^a 22nd July (1123)

(A.) HOUSE OF LORDS—*continued.*

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) [H.L.]	*Earl of Crewe*	Committee 11th July (3) Report 16th July (472) Read 3^a and passed 23rd July (1283)
Qualification of Women (County and Town Councils) (Scotland) [H.L.]	*Lord Hamilton of Dalzell*	Read 2^a 15th July (264) Committee 22nd July (1085) Report 23rd July (1309)
*Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries [H.L.]	*Earl Carrington*	Read 3^a and passed 11th July (32)
*Territorial and Reserve Forces	*Earl of Portsmouth*	Report 18th July (811) Read 3^a and passed 23rd July (1285)
*Vaccination (Scotland) [H.L.]	*Lord Hamilton of Dalzell*	Read 1^a 22nd July (1123)

(B.) HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Criminal Appeal	*Sir J. Walton*	Report 19th July (1049)
*Evicted Tenants (Ireland)	*Mr. Birrell*	Committee 17th July (712) " 22nd " (1230) " 23rd " (1375) " 24th " (1601)
*Finance	*Mr. Asquith*	Committee 11th July (157) Report 16th July (550) (631)
Larceny	*Mr. Courthope*	Read 1^o 16th July (550)
Lights on Vehicles	*Major Renton*	Report Read 3^o and passed } 11th July (191)
Married Women's Property	*Mr. Micklem*	Read 3^o and passed 16th July (648)
Petty Sessions Clerks (Ireland)	*Mr. Sloan*	Report Read 3^o and passed } 16th July (648)
*Post Office Sites	*Mr. Buxton*	Committee Report Read 3^o and passed } 19th July (1032)
Prohibition of Medical Practice by Companies [H.L.]	*Sir J. Batty Tuke*	Read 1^o 24th July (1600)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Sheriff Courts (Scotland)	*Mr. T. Shaw*	Read 2° 22nd July (1280)
*State Reformatories	*Mr. Gladstone*	Read 1° 24th July (1600)
*Telegraph (Money)	*Mr. Buxton*	Report 12th July (237) ,, 19th ,, (1023) Read 3° and passed 22nd July (1225)
Waste Lands (Ireland) Improvement	*Dr. Ambrose*	Read 3° 17th July (710)

INDEX

TO THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

[AUTHORISED EDITION].

TENTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1907.

JULY 11—*JULY* 24.

EXPLANATION OF ARRANGEMENT AND ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills: Read First, Second, or Third Time = 1R., 2R., 3R. [*c.*] = Commons. [*l.*] = Lords. *Amendt.* = Amendment. *Os.* = Observations. *Qs.* = Questions. *As.* = Answers. *Com.* = Committee. *Con.* = Consideration. *Rep.* = Report.

Where in the Index * is added with Reading of a Bill, or a Vote in Committee of Supply, it indicates that no Debate took place on that stage of the Bill, or on that Vote.

Subjects discussed in Committee of Supply are entered under their headings, and also under Members' Names, without reference to the actual Vote before the Committee.

Abbeyleix
- Unlawful Assembly Case, Procedure of.
  - *Q.* Colonel Lockwood; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *July 11*, 57.

Aberdare, Lord
- Injured Animals Act (1894) Amendment Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 810.

Aberdeen Corporation Order Confirmation Bill
- *l.* 2R.* *July 22*, 1078.
  - 3R.* *July 23*, 1281.
- *c.* 1R.* *July 24*, 1562.

Abinger, Lord
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep. July 18*, 875.

Abraham, Mr. W. [Cork County, N.E.]
- Mitchelstown Postal Facilities, *July 22*, 1186.

Abraham, Mr. W. [Glamorgan, Rhondda]
- Income-Tax Assessment of Sewers, *July 16*, 536.

Accidents
- Fatal Cases reported (1904–6).
  - *Q.* Mr. Laidlaw; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 17*, 666.

Admiralty
- *First Lord*—Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedmouth.
- *Financial Secretary* — Rt. Hon. E. Robertson.

Admiralty—*cont.*
- Contracts
  - Clothing Contracts placed with Scottish Firms.
    - *Q.* Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 17*, 675.
  - Foundry Contracts—System of Inspecting Work.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Courthorpe, Mr. A. Henderson; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 16*, 523.
    - *Q.* Mr. Lea; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 24*, 1574.
  - Wages paid by J. Brown & Co., and Vickers, Sons, & Maxim.
    - *Q.* Mr. W. T. Wilson; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 16*, 517.

Advertisements Regulation Bill
- *l. Com., July 11*, 23.
  - Report from Standing Committee, *July 16*, 466; *July 17*, 660.
  - 3R., *July 23*, 1284.

Africa
- Northern Territories Order in Council Presented, *July 22*, 1082, 1127.

Africa, Central
- British Laws running in.
  - *Q.* Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 22*, 1141.
- Zomba, Troops in.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 22*, 1167.

July 11—July 24.

Africa, East
[*See also* Names of Places.]
Land Reserves for Natives.
Qs. Mr. J. C. Wason, Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. Churchill, Mr. Speaker, *July 17*, 682–684.
Qs. Mr. J. C. Wason, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Arnold-Forster; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 22*, 1165, 1166.
Rupees used in—Allocation of Profit from Coining, &c.
Qs. Mr. Hay; *As.* Mr. Morley, *July 23*, 1324, 1325.
Q. Mr. Hay; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 1352.
Visit of Under-Secretary.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 22*, 1166.
Qs. Sir G. Parker, Mr. Rees, Mr. Healy; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 24*, 1579, 1580.

Africa, West
[*See also* Names of Places.]
San Thomè and Principé, Labour in.
Q. Mr. Arkwright; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 18*, 916.
Qs. Mr. J. C. Wason, Mr. Byles; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 22*, 1189, 1190.

Agriculture and Fisheries, Board of
President—Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.
Accommodation for.
Q. Mr. Lane-Fox; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *July 11*, 37.
Q. Mr. Ellis; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *July 24*, 1563, 1564.
Constitution, &c.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 11*, 49.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, Ireland
Vice-President—Rt. Hon T. W. Russell.
Dairy Industry, Encouragement to.
Q. Mr. Halpin; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 22*, 1183.
Horse-breeding Schemes.
Q Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 24*, 1587.
Working of
Cost of Inquiry.
Q. Mr. Gwynn; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 24*, 1564.
Date of Presenting Report.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *July 11*, 53, 54.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; A. Mr. Birrell, *July 17*, 702.

Ainsworth, Mr. J. S. [Argyllshire]
Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1743.

Alden, Mr. P. [Middlesex, Tottenham]
Congo Free State—Imports by way of the Nile, *July 23*, 1354.
Education
Hygiene Congress Arrangements, *July 15*, 335.
Medical Staff of Board, *July 15*, 308.
Schools, Grants for Erection, *July 22*, 1180.
Hague Conference, Attitude towards Protection of Private Property at Sea, *July 11*, 46, 47.
Navy
Electricians, Badge for, *July 17*, 666.
Torpedo-boat Crews, Medical Examination of, *July 22*, 1130.
Prisoners, Weak-minded, Treatment of, *July 22*, 1170.
Western Australia, Treatment of Aborigines, *July 11*, 43.

"Alexandra" Royal Yacht
Upholstery Contract
Qs. Mr. Watt; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 17*, 680, 681.

Aliens
Expulsion of Undesirables.
Os. Mr. A. Douglas, *July 18*, 984, 998, 999; Mr. Gladstone, 1000.
Working of Act—Report.
Os. Mr. A. Douglas, *July 18*, 984.

Allendale, Lord
Motors, Proposal as to Fresh Legislation for, *July 16*, 488.

Alton Military Hospital Bill
c. Rep. July 18*, 894.
3R.* *July 22*, 1125.

Ambrose, Dr. R. [Mayo, W.]
Belmullet Railway Extension to Mallaranny, *July 22*, 1154.
Waste Lands (Ireland) Improvement Bill, Intro., *July 17*, 710.

Anson, Sir W. R. [Oxford University]
Criminal Appeal Bill, *Com.*, *July 19*, 1051, 1060, 1062, 1063, 1065.
Education
Elementary Schools in Single School Areas, Grant for, *July 11*, 75–82.
Policy of Board, Reason for omitting Statement as to, *July 11*, 75.
Secondary Education—New Regulations issued in connection with, *July 11*, 75–82.
Training Colleges, Hostels in connection with—Government Policy as to, *July 11*, 75–77, 83, 101, 102.

Anstruther-Gray, Major [St. Andrews Burghs]
  Cavalry for Scotland, *July 15*, 315.
  Cellardyke—Case of Alexander Smith, *July 23*, 1326.
  Galapagos Islands, British Negro Subjects employed in, *July 18*, 914, 915.
  May Island, Illegal Trawling near, *July 15*, 338, 339.
  New Hebrides
    Importation of Arms, *July 18*, 913.
    Punitive Expedition of H.M.S. "Cambrian," *July 18*, 913.
  Rosyth Works, Expediting of, *July 16*, 524.
  Russia—Assault on Mr. T. Hutchinson at Odessa, *July 18*, 916.
  Russo-Japanese War—"Knight Commander" Case, *July 16*, 533.
  St. Helena
    Roads, Maintenance of, *July 15*, 317.
    War Office Property, Care of, *July 15*, 315.
  Turkey—Mr. Abbott's Ransom, *July 16*, 533, 534.

Anthrax
  Increase in, Causes of.
    Os. Mr. Gladstone, *July 18*, 934; Mr. H. J. Tennant, 965.

Ardagh
  Haire Case--Speech of Member for North Mayo.
    Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 24*, 1594.

Ardglass Harbour
  Churn Rock, Danger from.
    Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 22*, 1147.

Argyll
  Land for Afforestation Purposes.
    Q. Mr. M. Ferguson; *A.* Sir H. Campbell Bannerman, *July 18*, 907.

Arkwright, Mr. J. S. [Hereford]
  Africa, West—Labour in San Thomé and Principé, *July 18*, 916.

Armagh Urban District Council Bill
  l. Rep. July 16*, 465.

Army
  Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane.
  Parliamentary Secretary—Earl of Portsmouth.
  Financial Secretary—Mr. T. R. Buchanan.
  Ammunition
    Defective, Withdrawal of.
      Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 15*, 316.

Army—*cont.*
  Ammunition—*cont.*
    Smokeless Blank Cartridges, Provision of.
      Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 18*, 910.
  Anti-Typhoid Inoculation Statistics.
    Q. Sir W. J. Collins; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July* 23, 1334.
  Armour-piercing Projectiles, Inventor of Cap for.
    Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 197.
  Artillery
    Reductions under New Scheme.
      Qs. Mr. Arnold-Forster, Mr. Ashley, Mr. A. Chamberlain, Mr. L. Harris; *As.* Mr. Haldane, Mr. Speaker, *July 22*, 1161–1163.
    Smokeless Blank Cartridge, Provision of.
      Qs. Mr. Lupton; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 24*, 1575.
    Strength of.
      Q. Mr. L. Harris; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 17*, 682.
  Auxiliary Forces, *see titles* Militia, Volunteers, Yeomanry.
  Band—Condition of Engagement at Southgate.
    Qs. Mr. Branch; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 15*, 317, 318; *July 22*, 1163.
  Cavalry
    Divisional, Adequacy of Proposed Training.
      Os. Viscount Hampden, *July 17*, 658; Earl of Portsmouth, 659.
    Scotland, Allocation to.
      Qs. Major Anstruther-Gray, Mr. Younger; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 15*, 315, 316.
  Cordite, Addition of Mercuric Chloride, *see under* Explosives.
  Indian Army, *see under* India.
  Irvine Moor Sham Fight—Casualties occasioned by Heat.
    Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 22*, 1159.
  Maryhill Barracks, Occupation of.
    Q. Mr. Cochrane; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 15*, 316, 317.
  Morris Tube Cartridges available for Use.
    Q. Captain Faber; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 16*, 525.
  Officers
    Parliamentary Candidature, Regulations as to.
      Q. Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Mr Haldane, *July 18*, 910, 911.
    Staff Officers, Emoluments of.
      Q. Viscount Castlereagh; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 24*, 1569.

[*cont.*

July 11—July 24.

Army—*cont.*

Pay and Allowances, Lists of Exceptions Presented, *July 15*, 263, 301.

Pensions

Period for Paying.
Qs. Captain Faber, Mr. Crooks; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 16*, 524, 525.
Qs. Mr. Clynes, Mr. Crooks; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 23*, 1343, 1344.

Rule as to Commutation.
Q. Mr. James O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 18*, 898, 899.

Queen's Barracks, Perth—Mess Accommodation.
Q. Mr. Hay; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 15*, 314.
Q. Mr. Hay; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 23*, 1342.

Reserve—Regulation Presented, *July 15*, 263, 301.

Second Line, *see subheading* Territorial Forces.

Shooting Team, Payment of Cost of Colonial Visit of.
Qs. Mr. Courthope, Mr. R. Duncan; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Asquith, *July 23*, 1340–1342.
Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 24*, 1576.

Soldiers, Civil Employment on Discharge—Qualifications of Time-keeper on Devonshire Estates.
Qs. Mr. O'Shee, Mr. W. Redmond, Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 23*, 1342, 1343.

Territorial Force

Ballot Act, Powers of enforcing.
Os. Lord Lovat, *July 17*, 653; Earl of Portsmouth, 655.

Colours for.
Qs. Mr. Ashley, Viscount Turnour; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 15*, 315.

Establishment, Proposals as to.
Os. Lord Lovat, *July 17*, 653; Earl of Portsmouth, 655.

Musketry Training, Regulations as to.
Os. Earl of Donoughmore, *July 17*, 651; Earl of Portsmouth, 651, 653; Marquess of Salisbury, 652, 653; Earl of Bathurst, 652.

Property, Trusts, Subscriptions, etc., Decision as to handing over to County Associations.
Os. Lord Montagu of Beaulieu, *July 16*, 494, 495; Lord Loreburn, 495, 496; Marquess of Salisbury, 495.

Strength

Estimate of.
Qs. Mr. Arnold-Foster; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 22*, 1160, 1161.

Army—*cont.*

Territorial Force—*cont.*

Strength—*cont.*

Total Strength available for Home Defence.
Os. Lord Lovat, *July 17*, 653–656, 658; Earl of Portsmouth, 656, 658; Lord Newton, 656; Marquess of Lansdowne, 657, 658.

Training Principles—Statement Presented, *July 15*, 262, 301.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *see that title.*

Windsor Victoria Barracks, Date of commencing.
Q. Mr. J. F. Mason; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 23*, 1344.

Woolwich Arsenal, *see that title.*

Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hon. H. O. [Croydon]

Africa, East — Protection of Native Reserves, *July 22*, 1166.

Army

Artillery Reductions under New Scheme, *July 22*, 1161–1163.

Territorial Forces, Strength of, *July 22*, 1160.

Volunteers, Reduction Proposals, *July 22*, 1159.

Ashanti

Order in Council Presented, *July 22*, 1082, 1127.

Ashbourne, Lord

Divorce Bills—Return as to, *July 16*, 490, 492.

Poor Law Reform in Ireland, Necessity for, *July 22*, 1121.

Ashley, Mr. W. W. [Lancashire, N., Blackpool]

Africa, East—Land Reserves for Natives, *July 17*, 683; *July 22*, 1165, 1166.

Army

Artillery Reductions under New Scheme, *July 22*, 1162.

Territorial Force, Colours for, *July 15*, 315.

Blackpool Post Office, Erection of, *July 24*, 1568.

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 717–721, 752, 753, 769–774, 786; *July 22*, 1241, 1248; *July 23*, 1412, 1415; *July 24*, 1619, 1651, 1657.

Allocation of Time, *July 22*, 1211.

Lunacy—Case of R. Coles, *July 22*, 1170.

Navy—Number of Torpedo-boat Destroyers, *July 23*, 1335.

Newfoundland Fisheries—Negotiations with United States, *July 11*, 45.

Telegraph (Money) Bill, *Com.*, *July 12*, 244.

Ashton-under-Lyne, Stalybridge and Dukinfield (District) Waterworks Bill
- c. *Con.* July 15*, 299.
- 3R.* *July 18*, 893.
- *l.* Commons' Amendts., *Con.*July 23*, 1281.

Asia Minor
- British Interests, Safeguarding of.
  - *Q.* Sir E. Sassoon; *A.* Mr. J. A. Pease, *July 22*, 1168.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.—*Chancellor of the Exchequer* [Fife, E.]
- Army Shooting Team, Colonial Visit of, *July 23*, 1341.
- Cocoa Duty, Abolition of, proposed, *July 11*, 179.
- Colonial Loans with Imperial Guarantee, *July 17*, 668, 678; *July 23*, 1359.
- Colonial Preference—Attitude of H.M. Government towards, *July 15*, 370, 372, 374, 457.
- Corn Duty, Revenue derived from, *July 22*, 1133.
- Death Duties
  - Estates for which Reliable Accounts were produced, Allowance for Maintenance, etc., *July 11*, 174.
  - Landed Estates, Allowing Option of paying Duties in Land, proposed, *July 16*, 586.
  - Midleton Property, Payment on, *July 15*, 325.
- Finance Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 161, 167, 173, 176, 179, 180, 185, 186, 187, 188, 190; *Con.*, *July 16*, 553, 557, 558, 563, 565, 571, 575, 578, 580, 581, 586, 593, 595, 596, 598, 599, 601, 639, 647.
- Grant for New Schools, *July 15*, 326.
- Imports of Certain Goods, Revenue from, *July 15*, 326.
- Income-tax
  - Basis of calculating Incomes, *July 16*, 536.
  - British Subjects resident Abroad, *July 19*, 1023.
  - Business Discontinued, Three Years Average Assessment, *July 16*, 647.
  - Companies or Corporations to be assessed only in respect of Profits distributed among Shareholders, proposed, *July 11*, 174, 176.
  - Deduction for Cost of Insurance and Expenses of Management, *July 11*, 161, 167.
  - Dwelling-houses rented by Ministers of Religion, Allowing Deduction for, *July 11*, 186.
  - Earned Incomes
    - Landowner farming his own Land, Inclusion of, proposed, *July 16*, 571.
    - Pensions and Annuities, Inclusion of, *July 16*, 593, 595–599, 601.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.—*cont.*
- Income-tax—*cont.*
  - Incomes which have already paid Tax in the Colonies, Exemption of, proposed, *July 16*, 580.
  - Land in Ireland—Assessment of Occupiers, *July 23*, 1360.
  - Limited Liability Companies, Deduction of Expenses of Flotation, *July 16*, 575.
  - Married Persons, Assessing Incomes separately, proposed, *July 11*, 190; *July 16*, 578.
  - Notices of Assessment, Assimilating Procedure as to, in England and Scotland, *July 16*, 553, 557.
  - Payments made in respect of the Workmen's Compensation Act, Exemption of, proposed, *July 11*, 185.
  - Relief under New System—Issue of Supplemental Forms, *July 18*, 917.
  - Sewers, Assessment of, *July 16*, 537.
  - Three Years Average System, Working of, *July 16*, 639.
- Irish Public Works Loans, *July 16*, 538.
- Joint Stock Banks, Deposits in, *July 22*, 1150.
- Land Purchase (Ireland)—Estate Duty on Property of W. Humphrys, *July 22*, 1130.
- Land Values under existing Contracts, *July 15*, 326.
- Liverpool Bonded Warehouses, Inspection of, *July 22*, 1149.
- Post Office Savings Bank
  - Deficiency, Suggestion for Meeting, *July 18*, 918.
  - Rates of Interest, *July 18*, 917.
- Probate Fees—Age of Order, *July 22*, 1150.
- Savings Banks, Deposits in, *July 22*, 1150.
- Stamp Duty
  - Insurance Policies, Reduction of Scale for, *July 11*, 188.
  - Marine Insurance Policies, Reduction of Scale for, proposed, *July 11*, 187.
- Sugar Duty, Reduction of, on British and Colonial Sugar, proposed, *July 16*, 563, 565.
- Tea Duty
  - Contribution per head (1906–7), *July 17*, 687.
  - Irish Contribution, *July 22*, 1132.
- Telegraph (Money) Bill, 3R., *July 22*, 1229.
- Tobacco Revenue (1906–7), *July 17*, 668.

Assizes
- Winter—Orders in Council, Presented, *July 22*, 1081, 1177.

Atherley-Jones, Mr. L. [Durham, N.W.]
- Criminal Appeal Bill, *Com.*, *July 19*, 1063.

Attorney-General
Sir J. Walton.

Attorney-General for Ireland
Rt. Hon. R. R. Cherry.

Australia
[*See also* Names of States.]
Imports from United Kingdom, Duties on.
Q. Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 24*, 1565, 1566.
Industrial Property Convention, Commonwealth Accession to, Presented, *July 23*, 1283, 1311.
New Hebrides Convention, *see under* New Hebrides.

Austria-Hungary
Trade Report Presented, *July 18*, 810.

Avebury, Lord
Advertisements Regulation Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 28.
Limited Partnerships Bill, *Rep.*, *July 16*, 470.
Local Government Provisional Order (No. 8) Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 1282.

Ayrshire Foundry Company
Defective Rudder supplied by, *see* Navy—"King Edward VII."

Bach, Albert, Case of
Sentence, etc.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 16*, 538.

Baghdad
Customs Arrangements
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 11*, 46.

Balcarres, Lord [Lancashire, N. Chorley]
Elementary School, Teachers, Inadequate Supply of, *July 11*, 153.
Panama Canal—Contract for Work of Trinidad Labourers, *July 23*, 1352.
Post Office Sites Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 1034, 1036.
"Renown," Armament of, *July 11*, 40.
Telegraph (Money) Bill, *Con.*, *July 12*, 254; *July 19*, 1026.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. [London]
Business of the House, Course of, *July 11*, 64; *July 16*, 548; *July 23*, 1372, 1373.
Colonial Preference—Government Attitude, *July 15*, 447–457.
Death Duties on Landed Estates—Allowing option of paying Duties in Land, Proposed, *July 16*, 587.
Education
Elementary Schools in Single-school Areas, Grant for, *July 11*, 66–68, 113; *July 22*, 1190.
Training Colleges, Hostels in connection with, *July 11*, 68–71, 112.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*cont.*
Education Board Policy, Reason for omitting Statement as to, *July 11*, 65, 111.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 723, 730–732, 805; *July 22*, 1236, 1277, 1278.
Allocation of Time, *July 22*, 1195–1198.
Finance Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 587.
Food, Taxation of, *July 15*, 448–452.
Land Purchase—Correspondence between Mr. W. Moore and Commissioner Bailey, *July 23*, 1457.
Letter to *The Times* by Member for East St. Pancras—Breach of Privilege, *July 15*, 354.
Telegraph (Money) Bill, 3R., *July 22*, 1228, 1230.

Balfour of Burleigh, Lord
Advertisements Regulation Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32; 3R., *July 23*, 1285.
Qualification of Women (County and Town Councils) (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 22*, 1086.
Sheep—Valuation of Stocks, Effect of Section 1 of Agricultural Holdings Act, 1906, *July 22*, 1100–1102.
Vaccination (Scotland) Bill, Date of Second Reading, *July 22*, 1124.

Balintore Harbour
Inspection of.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 24*, 1563.

Ballinskelligs
Postmaster, Retirement of.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Captain Norton, *July 22*, 1185, 1186.

Balta Sound
Duties of H.M.S. "Hebe."
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 22*, 1181.

Banbridge
Petty Sessions, Cases heard at.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. R. Barry, *July 22*, 1184, 1185.

Banbury, Sir F. G. [London, City of]
Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 1058.
Death Duties on Landed Estates, *July 16*, 584–586.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 758–761, 792–794; *July 22*, 1230, 1231, 1260–1262; *July 23*, 1391–1393, 1395, 1412; *July 24*, 1620–1622.
Allocation of Time, *July 22*, 1212-1215.
Finance Bill, *Con.*, *July 16*, 562, 572, 577–578, 581, 584–586, 599–601, 637.

[*cont.*

Banbury, Sir F. G.—*cont.*
- Income-tax
  - Earned Income
    - Landowner farming his own Land, *July 16*, 572.
    - Pensions and Annuities, *July 16*, 599.
  - Incomes which have already paid Tax in the Colonies, *July 16*, 581.
  - Married Persons, Assessing Incomes separately, proposed, *July 16*, 577.
  - Three Years Average System, Working of, *July 16*, 637.
- Land Purchase—Correspondence between Mr. W. Moore and Commissioner Bailey, *July 23*, 1455.
- Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 1475-1477, 1505-1507.
- Post Office Sites Bill, *Com.*, *July 19*, 1032, 1033, 1034, 1039, 1044, 1045, 1046, 1047, 1049.
- Telegraph (Money) Bill, *Con.*, *July 12*, 237, 239, 240, 256–258; *July 19*, 1024, 1031.

Barnard, Mr. E. B. [Kidderminster]
- Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 1487–1489, 1503–1505.

Barrie, Mr. H. T. [Londonderry, N.]
- Education
  - Schools
    - Building Improvements, Grants for, *July 22*, 1134.
    - Provision of Retiring Room for Teachers, *July 22*, 1154.
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 741, 790; *July 22*, 1236, 1258; *July 24*, 1619, 1638, 1670.
  - Allocation of Time, *July 22*, 1215.
- Fisheries—Protection of North Coast, *July 22*, 1183.
- Navigation Works (Ireland) Bill, Proposals as to, *July 18*, 929.

Barrow River
- Drainage Proposals.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Meehan; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 17*, 697, 698.

Barry, Mr. R.—*Solicitor-General for Ireland* [Tyrone, N.]
- Banbridge Petty Sessions, Cases heard at, *July 22*, 1185.

Bass Rock
- Valuation of.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 22*, 1129.

Bathurst, Earl
- Army—Territorial Force, Musketry Training, *July 17*, 652.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep.*, *July 18*, 873-875, 885.

Beach, Mr. M. Hicks [Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury]
- Education Code, etc., Date of Circulating *July 18*, 925.
- Finance Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 157–161, 168; *Con.*, *July 16*, 568–570, 573, 631–634.
- Gloucester Pilotage Dues, *July 16*, 539.
- Income Tax
  - Deduction for Cost of Insurance and Expenses of Management, *July 11*, 157–161, 168.
  - Earned Incomes
    - Annuities, inclusion of, *July 16*, 631–634.
    - Landowner Farming his own Land, *July 16*, 568–570, 573.

Beale, Mr. W. P. [Ayrshire, S.]
- Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 1064.

Beauchamp, Earl
- Advertisements Regulation Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 24, 26, 27, 30, 31; 3R. *July 23*, 1285.
- Injured Animals Act (1894) Amendment Bill, 2R. *July 18*, 811.

Beauchamp, Mr. E. [Suffolk, Lowestoft]
- Naval Barracks, Number of Men in, *July 24*, 1570.

Beaumont, Mr. H. [Sussex, Eastbourne]
- Burial Grounds, Private, *July 16*, 539.

Beck, Mr. A. C. [Cambridge, Wisbech]
- Gooseberry Mildew, Measures for dealing with, *July 18*, 902.

Bedford, Duke of
- Militia, Special Reserve—Enlistment, Pay, etc., *July 15*, 268.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep.* *July 18*, 844, 851, 854-861, 885.
  - Forms of Attestation for Enlistment—Tabling, *July 15*, 267.
- Volunteers—Total Strength on 1st June, 1907, *July 15*, 268.

Bee-keeping
- Foul-brood, Measures for dealing with.
  - *Q.* Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *July 17*, 707.

Beechwood Park
- Untenanted Land, Purchase of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Hogan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 24*, 1595.

Belfast
- Death-rate, Inquiry into.
  - *Q.* Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 15*, 346.
- Dock Strike
  - Case of E. O'Reilly.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Jowett, Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cherry, *July 18*, 926, 927.

[*cont.*

Belfast—*cont.*
  Dock Strike—*cont.*
    Interference of Military Authorities.
      Qs. Mr. J. R. Macdonald. Mr. Birrell, *July 18*, 1018; Mr. Sloan, 1019; Mr. T. L. Corbett, 1020.
    Poor Law Relief necessitated by.
      Q. Mr. J. Delvin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 15*, 309, 310.
  Harbour Trust, Constitution of and Complaints against.
    Q. Mr. J. Delvin; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 12*, 194, 195.
  Postal Telegraph Staff Duties.
    Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 18*, 900.
  Welsh, W. and S., Case of.
    Qs. Captain Craig, Mr. T. L. Corbett; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 18*, 927, 928.

Belgium
  Mutual Surrender of Fugitive Criminals, Convention for, Presented, *July 22*, 1081, 1127.

Bell, Mr. R. [Derby]
  Derby Postal Telegraph Vacancies, *July 18*, 901.

Bell Rock
  Sum Paid for Use of.
    Q. Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 16*, 515.

Bellaghy
  Postal Mail Cart Contractor.
    Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 22*, 1143.

Bellairs, Mr. C. [Lynn Regis]
  Income Tax Payments of British Subjects Resident Abroad, *July 19*, 1023.
  Navy
    Channel Fleet
      Destroyers available for, *July 24*, 1570.
      Duties of, *July 24*, 1572, 1573.
      Strength of, *July 16*, 521.
    China Station, Destroyers on, *July 23*, 1335.
    Home Fleet, Evolutions of, *July 22*, 1157, 1158.
    Mediterranean Station, Destroyers on, *July 23*, 1335.
    Torpedo-Boat Destroyers, Life of and Number laid down, *July 16*, 520, *July 23*, 1338.
    White Paper, Publication of, *July 22*, 1158.

Belloc, Mr. H. V. P. R. [Salford, S.]
  Smith, Sir J. B., Knighthood conferred on, *July 11*, 60.

Belmullet
  Railway Extension to Mallaranny.
    Q. Dr. Ambrose; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 1154.

Belper, Lord
  Advertisements Regulation Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 24, 25, 28, 29.

Bermuda
  Annual Report Presented, *July 18*, 809, 895.

Bertram, Mr. J. [Hertfordshire, Hitchin]
  Law Courts—High Court of Justice, State of Business in, *July 12*, 222–225.

Bethell, Mr. [Essex, Maldon]
  Yeomanry Officers—Shortage in London Regiments, *July 15*, 307.

Bethell, Sir J. H. [Essex, Romford]
  Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 1516.

Bignold, Sir A. [Wick Burghs]
  Orkney Oyster Order, Report on, *July 16*, 513.

Bills
  House of Lords, Date of receiving, allowing Adequate Time for Discussion, etc.
    Os. Earl of Camperdown, *July 15*, 280; Lord Ribblesdale, 282, 284; Earl of Crewe, 290; Marquess of Lansdowne, 296.
  Initiation of more Measures in House of Lords, proposed.
    Os. Lord Ribblesdale, *July 15*, 282; Marquess of Lansdowne, 293.

Billywood
  Reinstatement Claim of A. H. Armstrong.
    Q. Mr. P. White; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 16*, 519.

Birkenhead Corporation Water Bill
  Report of Board of Trade Ordered, *July 18* 895; Presented, *July 19*, 1022.

Birmingham
  Post Office—Allocation of Duties.
    Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 18*, 896.

Birmingham, Bishop of
  Oxford and Cambridge Universities—Inquiry into Endowment, Administration and Teaching, proposed, *July 24*, 1526–1533.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*Chief Secretary for Ireland* [Bristol, N.]
  Agrarian Outrages (1906–7), *July 15*, 343.
  Agriculture Department, Working of—Date of Presenting Report, *July 17*, 702.
  Ardagh—Speech of Member for North Mayo on Haire Case, *July 24*, 1594.
  Barrow River Drainage, *July 17*, 698.
  Beechwood Park Untenanted Land, Purchase of, *July 24*, 1595.

[*cont.*

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
- Belfast
  - Death-rate Inquiry, *July 15*, 346.
  - Dock Strike
    - Intervention of the Military, Authorities, *July 18*, 1018.
    - Poor Law Relief necessitated by, *July 15*, 310.
  - Welsh, W. & S., Case of, *July 18*, 928.
- Belmullet Railway Extension to Mallaranny, *July 22*, 1154.
- Billywood—Case of A. H. Armstrong, *July 16*, 519.
- Birth Statistics for 1906, *July 23*, 1366.
- Cattle-driving in Ireland, *July 17*, 703.
- Charitable Donations, etc.—Meetings of Commissioners, *July 17*, 667.
- Clare, Extra Police, Charge for, *July 16*, 544.
- Clifden Pier Works—Cause of Delay, *July 15*, 345.
- Constabulary
  - Allocation of, *July 17*, 671.
  - Fanning-Constable, Case of, *July 17*, 674.
  - O'Shee, District Inspector, Promotion of, *July 17*, 673.
- Derrahiney Untenanted Land, Purchase of, *July 15*, 342.
- Douglas Estate, Sale of, *July 16*, 518.
- Dublin Metropolitan Police—Instruction as to Drunken Persons entering Licensed Houses, *July 23*, 1334.
- Dunraven Estate—Case of Mr. Spearing, *July 16*, 545.
- Education
  - Code, Date of Presenting, *July 17*, 705.
  - Grant
    - Amount for 1906-7, *July 16*, 545.
    - Equivalent to English £100,000, *July 24*, 1596.
  - Inspection
    - Annual Inspections, Instructions as to, *July 17*, 673.
    - Reinspection Regulations, *July 17*, 704.
  - Intermediate, Discussion on, *July 17*, 695.
  - National School Teachers
    - Increments and Promotions, Award of, *July 17*, 704.
    - Salaries of, *July 23*, 1368, 1369.
    - Statistics as to, *July 24*, 1591.
  - Rule 127 (*b*), Enforcement of, *July 24*, 1593.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
- Education—*cont.*
  - Schools
    - Building Improvements, Grants for, *July 22*, 1134.
    - Provision of Retiring Room for Teachers, *July 22*, 1154.
- Evictions
  - Age of Applicants for Reinstatement, *July 22*, 1135.
  - Claims of J. Meade and M. Tiernan, *July 12*, 196.
  - Farms, Information as to, *July 15*, 343; *July 23*, 1369.
  - Rejected Reinstatement Claims, *July 17*, 670; *July 18*, 928.
  - Statistics and Information (1901-1906) *July 18*, 904.
  - Voluntary Surrenders, System of dealing with, *July 15*, 344.
- Evicted Tenants' (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 713, 726-730, 756-758, 781, 785-788, 790, 806; *July 22*, 1230, 1231, 1234, 1237, 1242, 1259, 1261, 1270, 1277, 1279; *July 23*, 1376, 1383-1385, 1402, 1410, 1414, 1424, 1426, 1444; *July 24*, 1608, 1615, 1630-1632, 1637, 1651, 1658–1661.
  - Allocation of Time, *July 22*, 1207, 1208.
- Feeble-Minded Persons, Statistics as to, *July 23*, 1367.
- Fermoy Relieving Officer, Case of, *July 24*, 1589, 1590.
- Forthill Burial Ground, *July 24*, 1565.
- Goff Estate—Toneroe portion, Sale of, *July 16*, 545.
- Gortnakillue—Reinstatement Claim of M. Brady, *July 23*, 1333.
- Government Departments
  - Clerks, Information as to, *July 22*, 1153.
  - Return as to, proposed, *July 16*, 519.
- Grazing Farms held by United Irish League Officials, *July 15*, 342; *July 22*, 1137.
- Holywood Urban District Council—Case of J. H. Barrett, *July 18*, 906.
- Hudson Estate, Sale of, *July 18*, 905.
- Industrial Schools, Conditions of detaining Children in, *July 24*, 1591, 1592.
- Irvine Estate—Case of J. T. McQuade, *July 24*, 1593.
- Kanturk Extra Police—Case of Mr. Daly, *July 24*, 1588, 1589.
- Kenmare Estate
  - Cases of D. O'Shea and C. O'Sullivan, *July 24*, 1596.
  - Malicious Killing of Mr. Godfrey's Cow, *July 24*, 1594.

[*cont.*

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
- Killielagh—Speech of Member for Westmeath, North, *July 17*, 706; *July 24*, 1597.
- Kilmeedy Schools—Attendance, etc., *July 22*, 1134.
- Labourers Act—Article 13 of Order, Operation of, *July 17*, 696.
- Land Commission
  - Clerks—Pay, Promotion, and Classification, *July 22*, 1151–1153.
  - Wilkinson, Mr., Duties of, *July 17*, 700, 701.
- Land Judge's Court—Estates which Commissioners propose to purchase, *July 17*, 670.
- Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881, Amendment of, *July 17*, 697.
- Land Purchase
  - Mineral Rights, *July 22*, 1153.
  - Owners Refusing to Sell, *July 24*, 1564.
  - Philpott, Mr. J., Case of, *July 24*, 1565.
- Leahy Estate, Sale of, *July 24*, 1590.
- Local Government Board
  - Auditors, Appointment of, *July 17*, 699.
  - Promotion of Messrs. Jenkins, Monsell and Eckersley, *July 22*, 1152.
- Lunacy—Irish Statistics, *July 23*, 1367.
- Magan Estate, Sale of, etc., *July 11*, 37.
- Mountmellick
  - Case of T. Gaffney, *July 17*, 694.
  - Labourer's Cottage, Application of M. Delaney, *July 16*, 515.
- Mountshannon—Case of J. Macnamara, *July 24*, 1594.
- Navigation Works (Ireland) Bill, Proposals as to, *July 18*, 929.
- Newry Constabulary, Religion of, *July 18*, 904.
- Newtownforbes Meeting, Police Presence at, *July 16*, 517.
- Omara Estate—Case of P. Grace, *July 15*, 344.
- Persons receiving Police Protection, *July 23*, 1314.
- Pollock Estate, Sale of, *July 22*, 1154.
- Potato Crop, Condition of, *July 15*, 345; *July 16*, 518.
- Prison Warders, Salaries of, *July 17*, 700.
- Ruan Disturbance of 14th inst., *July 18*, 929.
- Singleton Estate, Sale of, *July 15*, 304.
- Sligo
  - Fishcuring Stations, Decisions as to, *July 22*, 1136.
  - Piers, Slips, etc., Expenditure on, *July 22*, 1137.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
- Swanlinbar—Petty Sessions Case of Mrs. Prior, *July 23*, 1368.
- Synan Estate, Purchase of, *July 22*, 1155.
- Tandragee—Case of S. Rainey, *July 17*, 701, 702.
- Tottenham Estate
  - Case of J. Fox, *July 22*, 1135.
  - Sale Proposals, *July 15*, 341.
- Trade Statistics, Date of Presenting, *July 17*, 697.

Births
- Statistics for 1906.
  - *Q.* Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 1366.

Blackpool
- Post Office, Erection of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *July 24*, 1568.

Blythswood, Lord
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep.*, *July 18*, 825, 826.

Board of Education Scheme (Hulme Trust Estates Educational) Confirmation Bill
- *l.* 2R., *July 22*, 1078.

Boiler Explosions Acts
- Working of—Report Presented, *July 16* 512; *July 17*, 650.

Boland, Mr. J. P. [Kerry, S.]
- Agriculture Board, Constitution of, *July 11*, 49.
- Agriculture Department, Working of—Date of Presenting Report, *July 11*, 53.
- Ballinskelligs—Postmaster, Retirement of, *July 22*, 1185.
- Bee-keeping—Measures for dealing with Foul Brood, *July 17*, 707.
- Canada—Irish Trade Statistics, *July 22*, 1185.
- Education
  - Code, Date of Presenting, *July 17*, 704.
  - Secondary Education—New Regulations, *July 11*, 92–97.
  - Training Colleges, Hostels in connection with, *July 11*, 92.
- "Forest Hall" Case, *July 11*, 58.
- Irish Trade Statistics, Date of Presenting, *July 17*, 696.
- Kenmare—Case of Rural Postman Shea, *July 18*, 895.
- Leahy Estate, Sale of, *July 24*, 1590.
- Low Valley Roman Catholic School, *July 11*, 95, 96; *July 17*, 692; *July 22*, 1177.

[*cont.*

Boland, Mr. J. P.—*cont.*
Mortomley School—Salaries of Teachers withheld, *July 11*, 94.
Swine, Irish
Diagnosis of Carlow Fever Case in 1905, *July 11*, 59.
Restrictions on Importations to England, *July 17*, 708.

Borneo
Brunei, Report on State of, Presented, *July 18*, 809, 895.

Bottomley, Mr. H. W. [Hackney, S.]
Public Trustee, Appointment of, *July 16*, 542, 543 ; *July 24*, 1585.
Titles, Taxation of, proposed, *July 11*, 63.

Boulton, Mr. A. C. F. [Hunts, Ramsey]
Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 1064.

Bowles, Mr. G. S. [Lambeth, Norwood]
Naval Training by Sail Drill, etc., *July 17*, 681.
Public Accounts Committee Report, Press Publication of, *July 22*, 1181.
Telegraph (Money) Bill, *Con.*, *July 12*, 239.

Boyle, Sir E. [Taunton]
Midland Railway Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 990.

Brace, Mr. W. [Glamorgan, S.]
Mines
Eight Hours Day—Legislative Proposals, *July 18*, 959.
Reports by Owners, Incomplete Nature of, *July 18*, 959, 960.
Rescue Appliances, Provision of, *July 18*, 960–963.

Branch, Mr. J. [Middlesex, Enfield]
Army Band engaged to Play at Southgate, *July 15*, 318 ; *July 22*, 1163.

Brewing
Hop Substitutes, Use of
Qs. Mr. Courthope ; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *July 16*, 540, 541.

Bridgeman, Mr. W. C. [Shropshire, Oswestry]
Finance Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 163-165, 189.
Income Tax—Deduction for Cost of Insurance and Expenses of Management, *July 11*, 163-165.
Volunteers—Position under Workmen's Compensation Act, *July 23*, 1344.

Brigg, Mr. J. [Yorks, W.R., Keighley]
Consular Reports, Weights, etc., used in, *July 18*, 896.

Brighton
Unemployed Funds, Expenditure of.
Q. Mr. Thorne ; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 18*, 923, 924.

Bristol
Pilot Dues.
Q. Mr. W. Hope ; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 11*, 47.
Postal Telegraph Delays.
Qs. Mr. W. T. Wilson ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 17*, 676, 677.

Bristol, Bishop of
Oxford and Cambridge Universities—Inquiry into Endowment, Administration and Teaching, proposed, *July 24*, 1533–1539.

British Museum
Literary Section, Cost of, etc.
Q. Mr. Ginnell ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 17*, 674, 675.

British North America Bill
l. Com., *July 16*, 466.
*Rep.** *July 17*, 660.
3R.* *July 18*, 892.

Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Water Bill
c. 2R.* *July 16*, 511.

Brownlow, Earl
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep*, *July 18*, 833.

Brunner, Mr. J. F. L. [Lancashire, S.W.]
Midland Railway Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 987–989.

Buchanan, Mr. T. R.—*Financial Secretary, War Office* [Perthshire, E.]
Artillery—Smokeless Blank Cartridge for Practice, *July 24*, 1575.
Militia
Officers selected for Discussion with War Office, *July 11*, 41.
Special Contingents, Inducements to join, *July 11*, 41.
Pensions, Period for paying, *July 23*, 1343, 1344.
Queen's Barracks, Perth, Accommodation in, *July 23*, 1342.
Scottish Standard, Rules as to displaying, *July 16*, 544.
Shooting Team, Colonial Visit of, *July 23*, 1341, 1342 ; *July 24*, 1576.
Soldiers, Civil Employment of—Timekeeper on Devonshire Estates, *July 23*, 1343.
Volunteers—Position under Workmen's Compensation Act, *July 23*, 1344.
Windsor, Victoria Barracks, Erection of, *July 23*, 1344.

Buckie
Registry of Sea-Fishing Boats—Order Presented, *July 22*, 1081, 1127.

Buckmaster, Mr. S. O. [Cambridge]
  Law Courts—High Court of Justice, Appointment of additional Judge, *July 12*, 205–213.

Bude Gas Bill
  l. 3R.* *July 15*, 261.
  c. Lords Amendments, *Con.* *July 19*, 1021.

Bull, Sir W. J. [Hammersmith]
  Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 1478, 1517–1522.

Burdett-Coutts, Mr. W. L. A. B. [Westminster]
  Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 1489.

Burghclere, Lord
  Oxford and Cambridge Universities—Inquiry into Endowment, Administration and Teaching proposed, *July 24*, 1547, 1548.

Burial Grounds
  Private Grounds, Legality of
    Qs. Mr. H. Beaumont, Mr. T. L. Corbett; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 16*, 539.

Burke, Mr. F. H. [King's County, Tullamore]
  Dooley, Rex. *v.*—Press Comments on Case, *July 17*, 707.

Burma
  Gôkteik Railway Bridge, Stability of.
    Q. Mr. Lea; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 24*, 1576.

Burns, Rt. Hon. J.—*President of the Local Government Board* [Battersea]
  Brighton Unemployed Funds, Expenditure of, *July 18*, 924.
  Colwyn Bay Water Supply, *July 22*, 1146.
  Croydon Vaccination Case — Cause of Death of Boy, *July 18*, 925.
  Infant Mortality, Prevention of, *July 18*, 899.
  Local Government Board
    Building Loans, Repayment of, *July 15*, 333.
    Report—Date of Issue, *July 23*, 1331.
  Marylebone Council School Managers, Appointment of, *July 24*, 1567.
  Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 1482-1485, 1498, 1509–1511, 1521-1524.
  Motor Track at Brooklands, Traffic in Vicinity of, *July 23*, 1360, 1361.
  Poor Law
    Audit of Accounts, *July 18*, 900.
    Children, Statistics as to, *July 23*, 1361.
  Public Health Act—Defaulting Local Authorities dealt with in 1906, *July 23*, 1331.

Burns, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
  St. Asaph—Sanitary Condition of District, *July 23*, 1331.
  Sewage Disposal—Final Report, Date of Presenting, *July 22*, 1175.
  Vaccination
    Calves Hired for Production of Lymph, *July 22*, 1146.
    Exemption Certificate Fees, Disposal of, *July 17*, 691.
  Workhouse Chaplains, Provision of, *July 22*, 1147.
  Workmen's Compensation Act—Insurance Powers of Local Authorities, *July 18*, 924.

Business of the House
  Course of.
    Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. J. R. Macdonald, *July 11*, 64; Mr. A. J. Balfour, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 16*, 648; Mr. A. Douglas, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 18*, 931, 932; Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. Healy, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Crooks, Mr. C. Craig, Mr. Shackleton, *July 23*, 1372–1375.
  State of, Progress made with Measures mentioned in the King's Speech, etc.
    Os. Earl of Camperdown, *July 15*, 269–281; Lord Ribblesdale, 281; Earl of Crewe, 284–290; Marquess of Lansdowne, 290–296; Lord Loreburn, 296–298.

Butcher, Mr. S. H. [Cambridge University]
  Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 742–744; *July 23*, 1414, 1433–1435.

Butter
  Irish—Railway Delays in Transmission to England.
    Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 17*, 709.

Butter and Margarine Bill
  Irish Salt Firkin Butter Trade, Effect on.
    Qs. Mr. McHugh, Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 15*, 339.

Buxton, Rt. Hon. S. C.—*Postmaster-General* [Tower Hamlets, Poplar]
  Basket Contract, Terms of, *July 17*, 692.
  Belfast—Telegraph Staff Duties, *July 18*, 900.
  Bellaghy—Postal Mail Cart Contractor, *July 22*, 1143.
  Birmingham Postal Duties, Allocation of, *July 18*, 896.
  Bristol Telegraph Delays, *July 17*, 677.
  Contracts—Observance of Fair Wages Clause, *July 22*, 1145.
  Derby Telegraph Vacancies, *July 18*, 901.
  Dublin Telegraph Messengers, Duties and Pay of, *July 17*, 676.

Buxton, Rt. Hon. S. C.—*cont.*
- Finance Bill, *Con.*, *July 16*, 574, 645-647.
- France, Telegraph, &c., Charges to, *July 11*, 48.
- Gorton, Postmistress, Pension Claim of, *July 23*, 1332.
- Income Tax
  - Business discontinued—Three Years' Average Assessment, *July 16*, 645, 646.
  - Limited Liability Companies, Deduction of Expenses of Flotation, *July 16*, 574.
- Kenmare—Case of Rural Postman Shea, *July 18*, 896.
- Kingston-on-Thames—Case of Mr. Maull, *July 15*, 303.
- Lewis, Island of—Stornoway Postal Facilities, *July 22*, 1143.
- Mail Service, Routes to Shanghai, *July 22*, 1144.
- Postmen, Procedure in dealing with Complaints against, *July 19*, 1023.
- Post Office Sites Bill, *Com.*, *July 19*, 1033, 1035, 1037, 1042-1046.
- Riverstown District Postal Facilities, *July 16*, 517.
- Sub-postmasters' Letter Boxes, *July 18*, 901.
- Telegraph (Money) Bill, *Con.*, *July 12*, 238, 240, 246, 253; *July 19*, 1025, 1026, 1031.
- Telegraph Service
  - Adult Night Messengers, Payment of, *July 18*, 901.
  - Boy Messengers, Sunday Duty of, *July 18*, 901.
  - Messengers, Employment for when over age, *July 22*, 1145.
  - Telegram Counting, New Scheme for, *July 22*, 1146.
- Telephone Service
  - Post Offices Connected by Telephone, *July 15*, 307.

Byles, Mr. W. P. [Salford, N.]
- Africa, West—Slavery in San Thomé and Principé, *July 22*, 1190.
- Children Employed on Half-time, *July 15*, 330.
- Factories—Fines on Women Workers, *July 15*, 331.
- Natal—Murder of Mr. Veal, *July 15*, 319.
- Parliamentary Debates, Reporting of, *July 22*, 1188.
- St. Helena—Treatment of Zulu Prisoners, *July 18*, 912.
- Telegraph (Money) Bill, *Con.*, *July 12*, 255.

Cabs
- Charges Levied on—Reduction, proposed. *Os.* Sir S. Scott, *July 18*, 970; Mr. H. Samuel, 981.

Cabs—*cont.*
- Horse-drawn, Use of Taximeters by.
  - *Q.* Mr. Straus; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 15*, 329.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 22*, 1169.

Caledonian Canal
- Report Presented, *July 18*, 895.

Cambridge University
- Endowment, Government, Administration and Teaching, Inquiry into, proposed.
  - *Os.* Bishop of Birmingham, *July 24*, 1526-1533; Bishop of Bristol, 1533-1539; Lord Ellenborough, 1539-1543; Bishop of Hereford, 1543-1547; Lord Burghclere, 1547-1548; Bishop of Oxford, 1549-1551; Earl of Crewe, 1551-1555; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1555-1559.

Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M. [Dublin University]
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 714, 722, 724-726, 744, 756, 774, 777-786; *July 22*, 1231, 1242-1244, 1255, 1275, 1276; *July 23*, 1379, 1382, 1393, 1409, 1438-1442; *July 24*, 1604-1607, 1611, 1612, 1617, 1643-1645.
  - Allocation of Time, *July 22*, 1217-1222.
- Indian Army Medical Officers, Pay of, *July 15*, 318.
- Roscommon Agrarian Cases—Change of venue, *July 17*, 705.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H.—*First Lord of the Treasury* [Stirling Burghs]
- Africa, East—Under Secretary's Visit to, *July 24*, 1579, 1580.
- Africa, West—Slavery in San Thomé and Principé, *July 22*, 1790.
- Business of the House, Course of, *July 11*, 64; *July 16*, 548; *July 18*, 932; *July 23*, 1373-1375.
- Church of England Worship, Changes in, *July 22*, 1188.
- Colonial Preference Resolution, Propriety of Entering in Journals as having been carried *nemine contradicente*, *July 15*, 463.
- Cromer, Lord, Grant to, *July 11*, 62, 63.
- Education (Scotland) Bill, Proposals as to, *July 22*, 1187.
- Egyptian Affairs, Discussion on, *July 11*, 59.
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill—Allocation of Time, *July 22*, 1192-1195.
- Foreign Office Vote, Discussion of, *July 16*, 546, 547.
- Forestry in Argyle and Forest of Dean, *July 18*, 907.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H.—*cont.*

Hague Conference — Attitude towards International Disarmament, *July 24*, 1597.

Home Office Vote, Discussion of, *July 22*, 1189.

Indian Affairs, Discussion of, *July 23*, 1360, 1371.

"King Edward VII.," H.M.S., Defective Rudder of—Reward given to Informant, *July 24*, 1598.

Law Officers of the Crown, Emoluments of, *July 22*, 1187.

Letter to the Times by Member for East St. Pancras — Breach of Privilege, *July 15*, 351–354.

Merchant Shipping—All British Line, *July 22*, 1155.

Pacific Islanders Act, Amendment of, *July 16*, 547 ; *July 22*, 1188.

Parliamentary Debates, Reporting of, *July 22*, 1188.

Parliamentary Elections—Reform Proposals, *July 11*, 64.

Parliamentary Relations between Lords and Commons—Legislative Proposals, *July 23*, 1370.

Peerages, Traffic in

Impeachment of Earl of Oxford in 1715, *July 18*, 929, 930.

Procedure as to Motions for Inquiry, *July 24*, 1598, 1599.

Prevention of Cruelty to Children Bill, Facilities for, *July 23*, 1370.

Scottish Estimates, Discussion of, *July 15*, 304.

Smith, Sir J. B., Knighthood Conferred on, *July 11*, 60, 61.

Sugar—Discussion of British Policy as to Brussels Convention, *July 18*, 931.

Supply, Discussion of, *July 16*, 547.

Titles, Taxation of, proposed, *July 11*, 63.

Vagrancy—Legislative Proposals, *July 24*, 1598.

Wireless Telegraphy—Discussion of Radio-telegraphic Convention Report, *July 11*, 62 ; *July 18*, 930, 931.

Worcester Election Petition Expenses, Rate levied for, *July 16*, 547.

Camperdown, Earl of

Bills, Date of Receiving—Allowing adequate Time for Discussion, etc., *July 15*, 280.

Business of the House—Progress made with Measures mentioned in the King's Speech, etc., *July 15*, 269–281.

Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 17, 21, 23 ; *July 22*, 1085, 1088, 1089.

Camperdown, Earl of—*cont.*

Sheep, Valuation of—Effect of Section 1 of Agricultural Holdings Act, 1906, *July 22*, 1089–1094, 1098, 1100, 1103.

Canada

Extradition Acts, Operation of—Order Presented, *July 22*, 1082, 1127.

Irish Trade Statistics.
Q. Mr. Boland ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 22*, 1185.

Steamship Communication with Germany.
Q. Captain Faber ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 16*, 532.

Winnipeg Unemployed Statistics.
Q. Mr. Clynes ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 17*, 685, 686.

Cape Colony

Legislative Assembly Resolution as to Government of Transvaal, etc.
Q. Mr. Mackarness ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 22*, 1164, 1165.

Cardboard Boxes

Import Regulations.
Q. Mr. Hay ; *A.* Runciman, *July 15*, 336.

Carlile, Mr. E. H. [Herts., St. Albans]

Criminal Appeal Bill, *Com.*, *July 19*, 1054, 1059, 1066.

Education Grants—Conditions of giving to Schools, *July 22*, 1178.

Law Courts—High Court of Justice, State of Business in, *July 12*, 201.

Post Office Sites Bill, *Com.*, *July 19*, 1038.

Telegraph (Money) Bill, *Con.*, *July 12*, 242 ; *July 19*, 1028, 1030.

Carrington, Earl—*President of the Board of Agriculture.*

Crown Estates converted into Small Holdings—Alleged Dispossession of Tenants, *July 16*, 502–508, 510.

Sheep, Valuation of—Effect of Section 1 of Agricultural Holdings Act, 1906, *July 22*, 1095, 1100.

Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir E. H. [Dublin University]

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 22*, 1231, 1238, 1239, 1259.

Castlereagh, Viscount [Maidstone]

Army Staff Officers, Emoluments of, *July 24*, 1569.

Education

Secondary Schools recognised, *July 23*, 1323.

Training Colleges

Grants, *July 23*, 1319.

Schemes for providing, *July 22*, 1130.

[*cont.*

Castlereagh, Viscount—*cont.*
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com., July 23*, 1388, 1397, 1425, 1429.
- Evictions—Area of Holdings, *July 23*, 1369.

Castletown, Lord
- Poor Law Reform in Ireland, Necessity for, *July 22*, 1111–1113.

Cave, Mr. G. [Surrey, Kingston]
- Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con., July 19*, 1053, 1057, 1063, 1073, 1075.
- Kingston-on-Thames—Case of Mr. Maull, *July 15*, 302.

Cavendish, Rt. Hon. V. C. W. [Derbyshire, W.]
- Public Accounts Committee Report, Press Publication of, *July 22*, 1181.

Cawdor, Earl
- Sheep, Valuation of—Effect of Section 1 of Agricultural Holdings Act, 1906, *July 22*, 1104, 1105.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep., July 18*, 883.

Cawley, Sir F. [Lancashire, Prestwich]
- Finance Bill, *Con., July 16*, 572.
- Income-tax on Earned Incomes—Landowner farming his own Land, *July 16*, 572.

Cecil, Lord R. [Marylebone, E.]
- Colonial Preference—Government Attitude, *July 15*, 430, 437.
- Education
  - Elementary School Teachers, Inadequate Supply of, *July 11*, 151.
  - Schools, Repair of—Powers of Local Authorities, *July 11*, 151.
  - Secondary Education—New Regulations issued, *July 11*, 149–153.
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com., July 22*, 1278; *July 23*, 1379; *July 24*, 1661, 1663.
- High Court of Justice, Appointment of Additional Judge, *July 12*, 213–217.
- Letter to *The Times* by Member for East St. Pancras—Breach of Privilege, *July 12*, 198; *July 15*, 346–349, 355.
- Llandwrog School, Desks for, *July 17*, 693.
- London County Council (General Powers) Bill, *Con., July 11*, 125, 138, 139.
- Lynch Case—Reason for granting Pardon, *July 15*, 328.
- Merionethshire School Teachers' Salaries, *July 17*, 693.
- Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con., July 23*, 1497, 1520.

Cecil, Mr. E. [Aston Manor]
- Income-tax Relief under New System, *July 18*, 916.

Cellardyke
- Case of Alexander Smith.
  - *Q.* Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 23*, 1326.

Central London Railway Bill
- *l. Rep.* July 17*, 649.
- 3R.* *July 22*, 1077.

Ceylon
- Crime in.
  - *Q.* Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 18*, 897.

Chairman
- Correspondence between Mr. W. Moore and Land Commissioner Bailey, *July 23*, 1452–1455.
- Division having taken place, it was not usual to Count the House, *July 17*, 772.
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill
  - Amendments, Order of moving, *July 22*, 1233; *July 24*, 1617.
  - Amendments out of Order, *July 24*, 1602, 1603.
  - Irrelevant Matter, *July 17*, 714, 716, 725, 741, 762, 763, 781, 782, 788, 792, 798; *July 22*, 1232, 1254, 1259, 1264; *July 23*, 1403, 1404, 1440, 1441, 1444, 1450; *July 24*, 1621, 1641, 1642, 1672, 1673, 1674.
  - Question of Merits could not be dealt with as a Matter of Order, *July 24*, 1610.
  - Question put, Mistake as to, *July 22*, 1276–1278.
  - Second Reading Speech in Committee, Procedure as to, *July 17*, 721, 722, 723, 773, 774, 777.
- Post Office Sites Bill—Question before the House being the Motion to Report the Bill, no Discussion could ensue, *July 19*, 1049.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. A. [Worcestershire, E.]
- Artillery Reductions under New Scheme, *July 22*, 1163.
- Death Duties on Landed Estates—Allowing Option of paying Duties in Land, proposed, *July 16*, 588.
- Finance Bill, *Com., July 11*, 162, 177, 188; *Con., July 16*, 553, 558, 564, 571, 575, 582, 588, 594, 601, 640, 647.
- Fiscal Policy—Food Taxation, *July 15*, 389.
- Gold and Silver Plate—Removal to Assay Office, Regulation as to, *July 11*, 188.
- Income-tax
  - Business discontinued—Three Years Average Assessment, *July 16*, 647.
  - Companies or Corporations to be assessed only in respect of Profits distributed among Shareholders, proposed, *July 11*, 177.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. A.—*cont.*
Income-tax—*cont.*
Deductions for Cost of Insurance and Expenses of Management, *July 11*, 162.
Earned Income
Landowner farming his own Land, *July 16*, 571.
Pensions and Annuities, *July 16*, 594, 601.
Incomes which have already paid Tax in the Colonies, *July 16*, 582.
Limited Liability Companies, Deduction of Expenses of Flotation, *July 16*, 575.
Notices of Assessment—Assimilating English and Scottish Procedure, *July 16*, 554, 558.
Three Years' Average System, Working of, *July 16*, 640.
Navy
Malta Torpedo Boat Flotilla, Strength of, *July 22*, 1157.
Mediterranean Fleet, Destroyers in, *July 24*, 1570.
Torpedo Boat Destroyers, Number of, *July 23*, 1335.
Smith, Sir J. B., Knighthood conferred on, *July 11*, 61.
Sugar Duty—Reduction on British and Colonial Sugar, proposed, *July 16*, 564

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster
Rt. Hon. Sir H. Fowler.

Chancellor of the Exchequer
Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith.

Chaplin, Rt. Hon. H. [Surrey, Wimbledon]
Colonial Preference—Government Attitude, etc., *July 15*, 412-426.
Fiscal Policy—Free Trade *v.* Protection, *July 15*, 413-419.

Cheetham, Mr. [Stalybridge]
Companies Bill—Operation of Clause 23, *July 15*, 334.

Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.—*Attorney-General for Ireland* [Liverpool, Exchange]
Abbeyleix Unlawful Assembly Case, *July 11*, 57.
Agriculture Department, Working of—Date of Presenting Report, *July 11*, 54.
Beekeeping—Measures for dealing with Foul-brood, *July 17*, 707.
Belfast Dock Strike—Case of E. O'Reilly, *July 18*, 927.
Crannagh Farm—Boycott of J. Haire, *July 11*, 57.
Dooley, Rex *v.*—Press Comments on Case, *July 17*, 707.
Drumkeerin District, Boycotting in, *July 11*, 54.

Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.—*cont.*
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 744, 754, 755, 760, 774; *July 22*, 1239, 1249, 1250, 1252, 1254, 1256; *July 23*, 1385, 1394, 1420-1422, 1428, 1435; *July 24*, 1604, 1610, 1611, 1618, 1624, 1653, 1663, 1664, 1680.
Holywood Urban District Council—Case of J. H. Barrett, *July 11*, 51, 53.
Labourers' Cottages—Inquiry into Rejected Applications, *July 11*, 55.
Lambert Minors Estate—Case of J. Costelloe, *July 11*, 56.
Listowel Land Commission Sittings, *July 11*, 58.
Maher Estate—Case of Mrs. Walsh, *July 11*, 54.
Mountgarret Estate—Case of Mrs. Kennedy, *July 11*, 55.
Roscommon Agrarian Cases—Change of Venue, *July 17*, 705, 706.

Chester
Case of T. Bowden.
Qs. Mr. Mond, Mr. Lupton; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 17*, 690, 691.

Chief Secretary for Ireland
Rt. Hon. A. Birrell.

Children
Employment of
Half-time, Increase in.
Q. Mr. Byles; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 15*, 330, 331.
Order No. 680, Operation of.
Q. Mr. George Roberts; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 16*, 538.
Poor Law, *see that title*

China
Concessions, Negotiations as to.
Q. Mr. C. E. Price; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 18*, 913, 914.
Opium, *see that title.*
Railway Contracts—Result of Negotiations.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 15*, 321.
Trade Reports Presented, *July 18*, 810; *July 24*, 1525.

Church of England
Changes in Worship, Parliamentary Assent to.
Q. Mr. A. Taylor; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 22*, 1188.

Churchill, Mr. W. L. S.—*Under-Secretary for the Colonies* [Manchester, N.W.]
Africa, Central
British Laws running in, *July 22*, 1141.
Troops in Zomba, *July 22*, 1167.

[*cont.*

Churchill, Mr. W. L. S.—*cont.*

Africa, East
  Land Reserves for Natives, *July 17*, 682–684; *July 22*, 1165, 1166.
  Rupees used in—Profit from Coining, etc., *July 23*, 1352.
  Visit of Under-Secretary, *July 22*, 1166.
Australian Import Duties on British Goods, *July 24*, 1566.
Canada
  Irish Trade Statistics, *July 22*, 1185.
  Steamship Communication with Germany, *July 16*, 532.
  Unemployment in Winnipeg, *July 17*, 686.
Cape Colony Legislative Assembly Resolution as to Transvaal Government, *July 22*, 1165.
Ceylon, Crime in, *July 18*, 897.
Colonial Office—Revision of Duties, *July 23*, 1325.
Colonial Preference—Government Attitude, *July 15*, 399-412.
Governorships of Colonies, Appointments to, *July 16*, 532.
Natal
  Leash, J., Assault on Coolie by, *July 24*, 1579.
  Veal, Mr., Sentences Inflicted for Murder of, *July 15*, 319.
New Hebrides
  Arms, &c., Importation of, *July 18*, 913.
  Convention, Licences Issued under, *July 16*, 533.
  Importation Restrictions on British Traders, *July 23*, 1348, 1349.
  Inspection of Female and Child Labour, *July 11*, 44.
  Punitive Expedition of H.M.S. "Cambrian," *July 17*, 687; *July 18*, 913.
Orange River Colony Farms, Valuation of, *July 23*, 1350.
Panama Canal—Contract for Work of Trinidad Labourers, *July 23*, 1351, 1352.
Rhodesia, Rabies in, *July 22*, 1164.
St. Helena
  Farmers, Assistance to, *July 22*, 1140.
  Grant in Aid, Proposals for, *July 23*, 1349, 1350.
  Labour for Transvaal, Conditions of Supplying, *July 22*, 1168.
  Legal Appeal Expenses, *July 22*, 1141.
  Magistrate's Salary, *July 22*, 1140.
  Police Force, *July 22*, 1139.
  Trading Facilities with Cape Colony, *July 15*, 319.

Churchill, Mr. W. L. S.—*cont.*

St. Helena—*cont.*
  Zulu Prisoners
    Condition of, *July 18*, 897, 912.
    Treatment of, *July 18*, 912.
Somaliland, Political Officers, Allowances of, *July 23*, 1347.
Transvaal
  British Civil Servants, Position of, *July 23*, 1350, 1351.
  Chinese Labour, Repatriation, Cost of *July 23*, 1325.
  Johannesburg
    Mines being worked in, *July 17*, 686.
    Tramway By-law, *July 11*, 43.
  Loan of £5,000,000, Issue of, *July 23*, 1348.
    Transvaal Bill, Proposals as to, *July 23*, 1347, 1348.
  Mines
    Conditions of importing Labour, *July 17*, 687; *July 24*, 1577.
    Report of Committee on Labour, *July 23*, 1353.
    Strike—Present Situation, *July 22*, 1167.
    Vacancies caused by Repatriation of Chinese, Replacement of, *July 15*, 320.
  Rupees, Payment of Mining Wages in, proposed, *July 23*, 1353.
  Workmen's Compensation Bill, *July 24*, 1578.
Trinidad
  Indentured Immigrants, Crimes of, *July 17*, 684, 685.
  Railway Employees' Grievances, *July 17*, 685.
Western Australia—Treatment of Aborigines, *July 11*, 43.

City of London (Union of Parishes) Bill
c. 2R.* *July 17*, 660.

Civil Service
Boy Clerks, Position of.
  Q. Mr. Hay; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 15*, 337.
Clerical Appointment System, Revision of.
  Q. Mr. Hay; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 18*, 896.
Pensions
  Commutation, Rule as to.
    Q. Mr. James O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 18*, 898, 899.
  Counting of Military Service.
    Q. Sir S. Scott; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 22*, 1138, 1139.
Superannuation, *see that title.*

Civil Service Estimates
Board of Education—£6,593,646, *Com.*, *July 11*, 65, 140.
Home Office—£128,735, *Com.*, *July 18*, 932.
Supplementary Estimate, Presented, *July 22*, 1129.

Clancy, Mr. J. Y. [Dublin County, N.]
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 22*, 1250, 1253, 1269; *July 23*, 1395, 1421; *July 24*, 1602, 1639.
Amendment omitted from Record in "Votes and Proceedings," *July 23*, 1372.

Clare
Extra Police, Charge for.
Q. Mr. Halpin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 16*, 544.
Potato Crop, Condition of.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 15*, 339, 340.

Cleland, Mr. J. W. [Glasgow, Bridgeton]
House-Letting System in Scotland—Date of Presenting Report, *July 22*, 1183.
Liverpool Bonded Warehouses, Inspection of, *July 22*, 1149.
London County Council (General Power) Bill, *Con.*, *July 11*, 126, 135, 140.

Clifden
Pier Works—Cause of Delay.
Q. Mr. O'Malley; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 15*, 344, 345.

Clough, Mr. W. [Yorks, W.R., Skipton]
Coal—Tare Weights of Wagons, *July 23*, 1362.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 724.
Giggleswick and Rathmell Charities, Administration of, *July 23*, 1364.
Kirk Smeaton Bridge, Width of, *July 23*, 1363.
Light Railway Commissioners, Names of, etc., *July 23*, 1362

Clynes, Mr. J. R. [Manchester, N.E.]
Army Pensions, Period for paying, *July 23*, 1343.
Canada—Winnipeg Unemployed, *July 17*, 685.
Post Office Basket Contract, Terms of, *July 17*, 692.

Coal
Tare Weights of Wagons.
Q. Mr. Clough; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *July 23*, 1362.

Coastguard
Abolished Stations—Disposal of Buildings.
Q. Mr. Mildmay; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 24*, 1571.

Coastguard—*cont.*
Reconstitution Proposals.
Qs. Mr. Courthorpe, Mr. T. L. Corbett; *As.* Mr. Lambert, *July 23*, 1336, 1337.
Scottish Stations, Decision as to.
Q. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 24*, 1575.

Cochrane, Mr. T. H. [Ayrshire, N.]
Education—Grant for New Schools, *July 15*, 325.
Maryhill Barracks, use for, *July 15*, 316.

Cocoa Duty
Abolition of, proposed.
Os. Mr. S. Roberts, *July 11*, 177–179; Mr. Asquith, 179; Mr. Hunt, 180–182.

Collins, Sir W. J. [St. Pancras, W.]
Army Anti-Typhoid Inoculation Statistics, *July 23*, 1334.

Collooney, Ballina and Belmullet Railways and Piers Bill
l. Rep. July 15*, 465.

Colne Valley Water Bill
c. Rep. July 23*, 1310.

Colonial Audit Branch
See under Exchequer and Audit Department.

Colonial Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Earl of Elgin.
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. W. S. Churchill.
Revision of Duties in.
Q. Mr. H. J. Tennant; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 1325.

Colonial Preference
Debates on, during Imperial Conference—Attitude of H.M. Government to expressed wish of the Colonies, etc.
Os. Mr. Lyttelton, *July 15*, 363–376, 388–390; Mr. Asquith, 370, 372, 374, 457; Mr. Soares, 376–386; Mr. Simon, 386–392; Lord Ronaldshay, 392–399; Mr. Churchill, 399–412; Mr. Chaplin, 412–426; Lord R. Cecil, 430–437; Mr. Lloyd-George, 444–447; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 447–457.
Resolution, Propriety of entering in Journals as having been carried *nemine contradicente*.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Speaker, *July 15*, 463.

Colonies and Protectorates
[*For* particular Colonies, etc., *see their names.*]
Annual Report Presented, *July 18*, 809, 895.

[*cont.*

Colonies and Protectorates—*cont.*
British Consuls appointed in.
Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 15*, 320.
Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 22*, 1171.
Governorships, Appointments to.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 16*, 532.
Loans with Imperial Guarantee.
Qs. Mr. Walrond; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *July 17*, 668, 678.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 23*, 1359.

Colwyn Bay
Water Supply.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 22*, 1146.

Companies
Joint Stock—Return as to Number Registered and Number Dissolved in 1906, Presented, *July 18*, 894.

Companies Bill
Clause 23, Operation of.
Q. Mr. Cheetham; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *July 15*, 334, 335.
Proposals as to.
Q. Mr Rendall; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *July 15*, 308.

Companies (Consolidation) Bill
l. 1R.* *July 18*, 810.
2R.* *July 23*, 1284.

Companies (Winding-up)
Report Presented, *July 12*, 194.

Condon, Mr. T. J. [Tipperary, E.]
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 22*, 1278.

Congo Free State
Imports by way of the Nile.
Q. Mr. Alden; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 23*, 1354.

Constabulary, Royal Irish
[*See also names of places.*]
Allocation of.
Q. Mr. O'Shee; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 17*, 671.
Fanning, Constable, Case of.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 17*, 674.
O'Shee, District Inspector, Promotion of.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 17*, 673.

Consular Service
See Diplomatic and Consular Service.

Cooper, Dr. G. [Southwark, Bermondsey]
George Children, Cases of, *July 23*, 1327.
Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 1520.

Corbett, Mr. T. L. [Down, N.]
Belfast
Dock Strike — Intervention of the Military Authorities, *July 18*, 1020.
Welsh, W. & S., Case of, *July 18*, 928.
Burial Grounds, Private, Legality of, *July 16*, 539.
Coastguard — Reconstitution Proposals, *July 23*, 1337.
Education Grant, Additional, *July 24*, 1595.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 775, 776; *July 22*, 1260; *July* 23, 1403, 1404; *July* 24, 1623, 1642, 1654, 1674.
Allocation of Time, *July 22*, 1217.
Finance Bill, *Con.*, *July 16*, 598.
Income-tax on Earned Incomes—Inclusion of Pensions and Annuities, *July 16*, 598.
Law Officers of the Crown, Emoluments of, *July 22*, 1187.
London County Council (General Powers) Bill, *Con.*, *July 11*, 124–127.
Post Office Sites Bill, *Com.*, *July 19*, 1033, 1037.
Telegraph (Money) Bill, *Con.*, *July 12*, 239, 242, 243; *July 19*, 1024.

Corn
Duty, Revenue derived from.
Qs. Mr. L. Harris; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *July 22*, 1132, 1133.

Cornwall, Duchy of
Lord Warden, *Earl of Ducie.*

Cornwall, Sir E. A. [Bethnal Green, N.E.]
Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1741.
Probate Fees—Age of Order, *July 22*, 1150.

Cotton, Sir H. J. S. [Nottingham, E.]
Ceylon, Crime in, *July 18*, 897.
India
Affairs, Discussion of, *July 23*, 1370, 1371.
Bengal—Sacredness of Parasnath Hill, *July 16*, 527, 528.
Johar Mandel and Ebrahim Munshi, Cases of, *July 16*, 527, 530.
Punjab, Condition of, *July 16*, 526.

Cotton Cloth Factories
Humidity in, Inquiry into.
Qs. Mr. Shackleton, *July 18*, 971

County Courts
- Fees of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Ferens ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 16*, 540.
- Plaints and Sittings—Return Presented, *July 18*, 894.

Courthorpe, Mr. G. L. [Sussex, Rye]
- Admiralty Foundry Contracts—Inspection of Work, *July 16*, 523.
- Army Shooting Team, Colonial Visit of, *July 23*, 1340–1342 ; *July 24*, 1576.

Courthope, Mr.
- Brewing—Use of Hop Substitutes, *July 16*, 540, 541.
- Coastguard — Reconstitution Proposals, *July 23*, 1336.
- Death Duties on Landed Estates, *July 16*, 583.
- Finance Bill, *Con.*, *July 16*, 580, 583–584, 640, 644.
- Income Tax
  - Business discontinued—Three Years Average Assessment, *July 16*, 644.
  - Incomes which have already paid Tax in the Colonies, *July 16*, 580.
  - Three Years Average System, Working of, *July 16*, 640.
- Militia
  - Officers selected for Discussion with War Office, *July 11*, 41.
  - Special Contingent, Inducements to join, *July 11*, 41 ; *July 16*, 525.
- Navy
  - Guns, 12-pounder, Supply of, *July 11*, 39, 40 ; *July 16*, 521, 522.
  - "King Edward VII," Rudder of—Inspection system, *July 11*, 38 ; *July 23*, 1337.
- Prevention of Cruelty to Children Bill, Facilities for, *July 23*, 1370.

Courtney, Lord
- Rye Bay, Illegal Fishing in, *July 16*, 522.
- Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 20.
- Qualification of Women (County and Town Councils) (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 22*, 1087.

Coventry Corporation Bill.
- *c. Con.* July 22*, 1125.

Cox, Mr. H. [Preston]
- Colonies, British Consuls in, *July 15*, 320 ; *July 22*, 1171.
- Cunard Line—Reason for not calling at Halifax (N.S.), *July 15*, 334.
- Egypt, Postal Rates in, *July 23*, 1356.
- Finance Bill, *Con.*, *July 16*, 558, 566–567, 567.

Cox, Mr. H.—*cont.*
- Income-tax — Notices of Assessment in England and Scotland, *July 16*, 558.
- Merchant Shipping—Insurance Rates on Certain Routes, *July 15*, 334.
- Post Office Mail Service
  - P. & O. Contract, *July 22*, 1175.
  - Shanghai, Routes to, *July 22*, 1144.
- Sugar Duty—Reduction on British and Colonial Sugar, proposed, *July 16*, 566.
- Telegraph (Money) Bill, *Con.*, *July 12*, 242, 247–249 ; *Con.*, *July 19*, 1023, 1028, 1031 ; 3R., *July 22*, 1225–1228.
- Transvaal Mine Strike—Present situation, *July 22*, 1167.
- West Indies Naval Force, *July 15*, 314 ; *July 23*, 1338.

Craig, Captain J. [Down, E.]
- Belfast—Cases of W. & S. Welsh, *July 18*, 927.
- Fermoy Relieving Officer, Case of, *July 24*, 1589.
- Kenmare Estate—Killing of Mr. Godfreys, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1593.
- Newry Constabulary, Religion of, *July 18*, 903.

Craig, Mr. C. C. [Antrim, S.]
- Ardagh—Speech of Member for North Mayo, *July 24*, 1594.
- Business of the House, Course of, *July 23*, 1374.
- Cattle-driving in Ireland, *July 17*, 703.
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 722, 761–766, 796–799 ; *July 22*, 1232, 1247, 1249, 1250, 1251, 1263, 1272–1274 ; *July 23*, 1381, 1396, 1404, 1442 ; *July 24*, 1603, 1606–1608, 1610, 1615, 1623, 1639–1641, 1653, 1671–1674, 1680.
  - Allocation of Time, *July 22*, 1200, 1203–1206.
- Fermoy Relieving Officer, Case of, *July 24*, 1590.
- Forthill Burial Ground, *July 24*, 1565.
- Killielagh—Speech of Member for Westmeath (North), *July 17*, 706 ; *July 24*, 1596, 1597.

Craig, Mr. H. J. [Tynemouth]
- Law Courts—High Court of Justice, State of Business in, *July 12*, 217–221.
- Navy—Channel Fleet, Duties of, *July 24*, 1572.

Craik, Sir H. [Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities]
- Education—Issue of Welsh Code, etc., *July 22*, 1179.
- London County Council (General Powers) Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 136.

Crannagh Farm
Boycott of J. Haire.
Qs. Colonel Lockwood, Mr. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cherry, *July 11*, 56, 57.

Crewe, Earl of—*Lord President of the Council.*
Bills, Date of Receiving — Allowing Adequate Time for Discussion, etc., *July 15*, 290.
Board of Education Scheme (Hulme Trust Estates Educational) Confirmation Bill, 2R., *July 22*, 1078, 1080.
Business of the House—Progress made with Measures mentioned in the King's Speech, *July 15*, 284–290.
Ecclesiastical Commissioners—Return in Continuation of Return No. 71, *July 22*, 1085.
Oxford and Cambridge Universities—Inquiry into Endowment, etc., proposed, *July 24*, 1551–1555.
Poor Law Reform in Ireland, Necessity for, *July 22*, 1116–1120, 1121.
Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 6–8, 16, 18–21.
Qualification of Women (County and Town Councils) (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 22*, 1088, 1089.
Sheep, Valuation of—Effect of Section 1 of Agricultural Holdings Act, 1906, *July 22*, 1105.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep.*, *July 18*, 823, 830, 837, 839, 846, 853, 884, 890, 3R., *July 23*, 1302.

Criminal Appeal Bill
c. Con., *July 19*, 1049.
Debate on Consideration [Commons], *July 19*, 1050.
Appeal Application to be treated as the Substantive Appeal, proposed, 1050–1054.
Cases where it would be Convenient that Separate Judgments should be pronounced, 1061.
Fact, Appeal on Questions of—Omission of Subsection dealing with, proposed, 1069–1076.
House of Lords, Cases in which Appeal may be made to, 1062–1064.
Judges, Additional—Appointment of, 1057-1061.
Limitation of Right of Appeal to Persons Convicted of an Indictable Offence other than an Indictable Offence triable by Summary Jurisdiction, 1065–1067.
Postponement of Bill until not less than Three Additional Judges had been appointed, proposed, 1057–1059.

Crombie, Mr. J. W. [Kincardineshire]
Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *July 16*, 625-626.

Cromer, Lord
Grant to.
Qs. Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 11*, 62, 63.

Crooks, Mr. W. [Woolwich]
Army Pensions, Period for Paying, *July 16*, 524; *July 23*, 1344.
Business of the House, Course of, *July 23*, 1374.

Crossley, Mr. W. J. [Cheshire, Altrincham]
Midland Railway Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 991.

Crown Lands Act, 1906
Report Presented, *July 16*, 466, 513.

Croydon
Vaccination Case—Cause of Death of Boy, etc.
Qs. Mr. Lupton; *As.* Mr. Burns, *July 18*, 924, 925.

Cullinan, Mr. J. [Tipperary, S.]
Timber Clearances in Ireland, *July 11*, 49.

Cunard Line
Halifax (N.S.), Reason for Abandoning as as Port of Call.
Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. Kearley. *July 15*, 334.

Curran, Mr. P. [Durham, Jarrow]
Fiscal Policy—Free Trade *v.* Protection, *July 15*, 426–430.

Cyprus
Government—Orders in Council Presented, *July 22*, 1082, 1127.

Dalziel, Mr. J. H. [Kirkcaldy Burghs]
Finance Bill, *Con.*, *July 16*, 557.
Income-tax — Notices of Assessment, Assimilating Procedure as to in England and Scotland, *July 16*, 557.

Dartmoor Prison
Ellis and Parrish, Sentences on.
Qs. Mr. Hazleton, Mr. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 17*, 689, 690.
Lincoln and Hogan, Sentences on.
Qs. Mr. Hazleton Mr. W. Redmond, Mr. MacNeill, Mr. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Speaker, *July 17*, 687–689.

Davies, Mr. T. [Fulham]
Wages Return, Form of, *July 24*, 1583.

Death Duties
Estates for which Reliable Accounts were produced, Allowance for Maintenance, etc.
Os. Colonel Kenyon-Slaney, *July 11*, 171–174; Mr. Asquith, 174.

Landed Estates, Allowing Option of paying Duties in Land, proposed.
Os. Mr. Courthope, *July 16*, 583; Sir F. Banbury, 584-586; Mr. Asquith, 586; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 587; Mr. A. Chamberlain, Mr. Younger, Mr. Wyndham, 588; Mr. Parker, 589.

Midleton Property, Payment on.
Q. Mr. Lea; Mr. Asquith, *July 15*, 325.

Defence of the Empire
Home Waters, Responsibility for Defence of.
Qs. Mr. Gretton; *As.* Mr. Lambert, *July 23*, 1339, 1340.

Denman, Lord
Advertisements Regulation Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 32.
Evicted Tenants, Progress made with Reinstatement—Return, *July 24*, 1560.
Poor Law Reform in Ireland, Necessity for, *July 22*, 1122.

Denmark
Trade Report Presented, *July 22*, 1080.

Derby
Postal Telegraph Vacancies.
Q. Mr. Bell; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 18*, 901.

Derrahiney
Untenanted Land, Purchase of.
Q. Mr. J. Roche; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 15*, 342.

Devlin, Mr. J. [Belfast, W.]
Belfast
Dock Strike, Poor Relief necessitated by, *July 15*, 309.
Harbour Trust, Constitution of, *July 12*, 194.
Holywood Urban District Council—Case of J. H. Barrett, *July 18*, 905.
Irish Charitable Donation, etc.—Meetings of Commissioners, *July 17*, 667.

Devonport Corporation Bill
c. Con. July 11*, 33.
3R.* *July 15*, 299.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.* July 16*, 465.

Dewar, Mr. A. [Edinburgh, S.]
"King Edward VII.," Defective Rudder of, *July 24*, 1574.

Dewar, Sir J. A. [Inverness]
Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *July 16*, 622–624.

Dhu Heartach Rock
Sum paid for use of.
Q. Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 16*, 515.

Dickinson, Mr. W. H. [St. Pancras, N.]
Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 1499–1503.
Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1735–1737.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir C. W. [Gloucester, Forest of Dean]
Fish-Curing, Sanitary Conditions of Work, *July 18*, 950.
Florists' Hours of Labour, *July 18*, 951.
Fruit-preserving Industry, Hours of Labour, *July 18*, 950.
Labour Conference at Berne, Recommendations of, *July 18*, 941.
Lead Poisoning, Increase in Cases—Enforcement of Regulations and Use of Leadless Glaze, *July 18*, 942–949.

Diplomatic and Consular Service
Reports of Consuls, Weights and Measures in.
Q. Mr. Brigg; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 18*, 896 897.

Divorce Bills
Return as to for last five years, proposed.
Os. Earl Russell, *July 16*, 490–494; Lord Ashbourne, 490, 492; Lord Loreburn, 491.

Docks
Inspection, Improved System of.
Os. Mr. Gladstone, *July 18*, 935.

Dockyards, Naval
See under Navy.

Donelan, Captain A. J. C. [Cork, E.]
Timber Clearances in Ireland, *July 11*, 50.

Donoughmore, Earl of
Evicted Tenants, Progress made with Reinstatement—Return, *July 24*, 1559, 1561.
Territorial Force, Musketry Training, Regulations as to, *July 17*, 651.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep.*, *July 18*, 835, 836, 846; 3R., *July 23*, 1295–1297, 1301.

Dooley, Rex *v.*
Press Comments on Case.
Q. Mr. H. Burke; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *July 17*, 707.

Doonass Property
Case of Mr. M. Shearin.
Qs. Mr. Halpin, Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 24*, 1592.

Douglas Estate
Sale of.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 16*, 518.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. A. [Kent, St. Augustine's]
Aliens
Expulsion of Undesirables, *July 18*, 984, 998, 999.
Working of Act—Report on, *July 18*, 984.
Business of the House, Course of, *July 18*, 931.
Explosives, Use of Mercuric Chloride by Messrs. Kynochs—Terms of Agreement with Home Office, *July 18*, 984, 999.
Labour Conference at Berne, Recommendations of—Accession of Japan to, etc., *July 18*, 983.
Laundries in Religious Institutions—Inspection of, *July 18*, 983.
Home Office Commissions, Work entailed by, *July 18*, 982.
Mines
Accidents, Increase in Number of, *July 18*, 981.
Eight Hours Day—Legislative Proposals, *July 18*, 981.
Rescue Appliances, Provisions of, *July 18*, 981.
Phosphorus Substitutes in the Match Trade, Making use of, compulsory, *July 18*, 984.
Police Commission Report, Date of issuing, *July 18*, 982.
Vivisection—Report of Royal Commission, *July 18*, 998.

Drumkeerin
Boycotting in District.
Q. Col. Lockwood; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *July 11*, 54.

Dublin
Metropolitan Police—Instructions as to Drunken Persons entering Licensed Houses.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 1333, 1334.
Post Office Telegraph Messengers, Duties and Pay of.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 17*, 675, 676.

Duncan, Mr. R. [Lanark, Govan]
Army Shooting Team, Colonial Visit of, *July 23*, 1341.
Education (Scotland) Bill, Proposals as to, *July 22*, 1187.
Income Tax—Basis of Calculating Incomes, *July 16*, 536.

Duncan, Mr. R.—*cont.*
Indian Rupee, Profit on Coining, *July 16*, 525.
Letter to *The Times* by Member for East St. Pancras—Breach of Privilege, *July 15*, 356.

Dundee Corporation Order Confirmation Bill
c. 3R* *July 11*, 33.

Dundonald, Earl of
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep.*, *July 18*, 843.

Dunn, Mr. A. E. [Cornwall, Camborne]
Parliamentary Elections—Reform Proposals, *July 11*, 63.

Dunraven Estate
Case of Mr. G. Spearing.
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 16*, 545.

Durham
Schoolmasters holding other Offices.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 17*, 678.

Ecclesiastical Commissioners
Return in Continuation of Return No. 71 (14th May, 1877)—Ordered, *July 22*, 1083-1085.

Edalji Case
Circumstances of, Authorship of Anonymous Letters, etc.
Os. Mr. F. E. Smith, *July 18*, 1004-1016; Mr. Gladstone, 1017.

Education, Board of
President—Rt. Hon. R. McKenna.
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. T. Lough.
Medical Staff.
Q. Mr. Alden; *A.* Mr. Lough, *July 15*, 308.
Policy, Reason for omitting Statement as to.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 11*, 65, 111; Mr. McKenna, 71, 111; Sir W. Anson, 75.
Vote for, *July 11*, 65, 140.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London No. 1) Bill
c. 2R.* *July 19*, 1021.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London No. 2) Bill
c. *Rep.** *July 18*, 893.
3R*. *July 19*, 1021.

Education (England and Wales)
[*For particular places, see their names.*]
Attendance Statistics.
Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 11*, 48.

[*cont.*

Education (England and Wales)—*cont.*

Code, Date of Circulating.
Q. Mr. H. Beach ; *A.* Mr. Lough, *July 18*, 925.

Defective Children — Regulations for Schools Presented, *July 23*, 1283, 1311.

Elementary Schools

Grant for, in Single-school Areas.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 11*, 66–68, 113 ; Sir W. Anson, 75–82 ; Mr. McKenna, 104, 105 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 22*, 1190 ; Mr. Speaker, 1191.

Policy as to.
Os. Mr. Harvey, *July 11*, 90–92 ; Mr. McKenna, 107, 154.

Teachers, Inadequate Supply of.
Os. Mr. Pickersgill, *July 11*, 114, 115 ; Lord R. Cecil, 151 ; Lord Balcarres, 153.

Funds applied under Certain Acts—Return ordered, *July 11*, 35.

George Children, Cases of.
Q. Dr. Cooper ; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 23*, 1327, 1328.

Grants

Conditions of giving to Schools.
Qs. Mr. Carlile ; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 22*, 1178.

Number and Nature of.
Os. Mr. S. T. Evans, *July 11*, 87.

Meals for Children, Provision of, Administration of Regulations.
Os. Mr. Masterman, *July 11*, 118.

Moral Instruction, Absence of Provision for.
Os. Mr. Masterman, *July 11*, 121, 122 ; Mr. Yoxall, 124, 141.

Necessitous Areas—Policy as to Grants.
Os. Mr. Masterman, *July 11*, 119–121.

School Hygiene Congress Arrangements.
Qs. Dr. Rutherford, Mr. Alden, Mr. J. R. Macdonald ; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 15*, 335.

Schools

Air Space in.
Os. Mr. Yoxall, *July 11*, 142 ; Mr. Snowden, 144.

Building Grant, Allocation of.
Q. Mr. Gretton ; *A.* Mr. Lough, *July 24*, 1584.

Erection of—Applications for Grants.
Qs. Mr. S. Roberts, Mr. Alden ; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 22*, 1179–1180.

Repair of—Powers of Local Authorities to withold Grants for Non-compliance.
Os. Mr. S. T. Evans, *July 11*, 85 ; Mr. McKenna, 108–110 ; Lord R. Cecil, 151.

Transfer Statistics.
Q. Mr. Ellis ; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 23*, 1327, 1528.

Education (England and Wales)—*cont.*

Secondary Education—New Regulations issued.
Os. Sir W. Anson, *July* 11, 75–82 ; Mr. S. T. Evans, 82–88 ; Mr. Boland, 92–97 ; Mr. W. Redmond, 97–100 ; Colonel Lockwood, 115–117 ; Mr. Masterman, 117 ; Lord E. Talbot, 122, 123 ; Mr. Snowden, 143–146 ; Mr. T. P. O'Connor, 146–149 ; Lord R. Cecil, 149–153.
Q. Mr. H. Beach ; *A.* Mr. Lough, *July 18*, 925.

Secondary Schools—Number recognised, etc.
Q. Viscount Castlereagh ; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 23*, 1323.

Temperance, Teaching of.
Q. Mr. Wedgwood ; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 11*, 36.

Training Colleges

Grants to.
Q. Viscount Castlereagh ; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 23*, 1319, 1320.

Hostels in Connection with—Government Policy.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 11*, 68–71, 112 ; Sir W. Anson, 75–77, 83, 101, 102 ; Mr. S. T. Evans, 82–85 ; Mr. Boland, 92 ; Mr. W. Redmond, 98–100 ; Mr. McKenna, 100–102, 105, 106 ; Mr. Yoxall, 141 ; Mr. T. P. O'Connor, 147–149.

Schemes for Provision of.
Q. Viscount Castlereagh ; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 22*, 1130.

Welsh Code, etc., Issue of.
Q. Sir H. Craik ; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 22*, 1179.
Qs. Mr. S. Roberts ; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 22*, 1180.

Education (Ireland).

[*For* particular Places, *see their names.*]

Code, Date of Presenting.
Q. Mr. Boland ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 17*, 704, 705.

Grant

Amount for 1906–7.
Q. Meagher ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 16*, 545.

Equivalent to English £100,000, Proposals for.
Qs. Mr. T. L. Corbett ; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 24*, 1595, 1596.

Inspection

Annual Inspections, Instructions as to.
Q. Mr. Sloan ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 17*, 672, 673.

Re-inspection, Method of granting.
Q. Mr. Sloan ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 17*, 704.

Intermediate—Facilities for Discussion.
Qs. Mr. J. Redmond ; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 17*, 694, 695.

[*cont.*

Education (Ireland)—*cont.*
National School Teachers
Increments and Promotions, Delay in Awarding.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 17*, 703, 704.
Insurance of.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 17*, 673.
Salaries of.
Qs. Mr. Mooney; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 1368, 1369.
Statistics as to.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 24*, 1591.
Rule 127 (b), Enforcement of.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 24*, 1592, 1593.
Schools
Building Improvements, Grants for.
Q. Mr. Barrie; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 1134.
Provision for Retiring Room for Teachers.
Q. Mr. Barrie; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 1154.

Education (Scotland).
Vice-President of the Council—Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.
[*For* particular Places, *see their names.*]
Grant for New Schools.
Q. Mr. Cochrane; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 15*, 325, 326.

Education (Scotland) Bill
Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. R. Duncan; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 22*, 1187.

Edwards, Mr. A. C. [Denbigh District]
Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1732, 1738.

Egypt
Affairs of, Parliamentary Discussion proposed.
Qs. Dr. Rutherford, Mr. Rees; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 11*, 59.
Bemba, Turkish Troops in.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 23*, 1357.
Census, Taking of.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; Sir E. Grey, *July 16*, 534.
Educational Posts, Egyptians in.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 18*, 915.
Government Officials, Salaries of.
Q. Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 23*, 1355.

Egypt—*cont.*
Khedivial School of Law
Evening Classes.
Qs. Mr. MacNeill, Mr. J. M. Robertson; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 16*, 535, 536.
Rectorship of—Case of Mr. Lambert.
Qs. Dr. Rutherford, Mr. J. M. Robertson, Sir G. Parker; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 16*, 535.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. J. A. Pease, *July 22*, 1169.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 23*, 1358.
Plague, Deaths from.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 11*, 44.
Postal Rates in.
Qs. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 18*, 914.
Qs. Mr. J. M. Robertson, Mr. Cox; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 23*, 1356, 1357.
Regent, Identity of.
Qs. Mr. J. M. Robertson, Mr. MacNeill; *As.* Sir. E. Grey, Mr. Speaker, *July 23*, 1357, 1358.
State Railways and Telegraphs—Items of Expenditure.
Q. Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Sir E. Grey *July 23*, 1355.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill
c. 2R.* *July 16*, 511.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill
*l. Rep.** *July 11*, 2.
3R.* *July 15*, 261.
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.** *July 17*, 660.

Electric Supply Corporation Bill
*c. Rep.** *July 18*, 893.
3R.* *July 22*, 1125.

Eleven o'Clock Rule
Suspension of—*Motion* [Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman], *July 15*, 362.

Elgin and Kincardine, Earl of—*Secretary of State for the Colonies*
British North America Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 466–469.
Fiji—Sale of Lands in Rewa and Naitasiri, *July 16*, 480–483.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 3R., *July 23*, 1298–1300, 1307.

Ellenborough, Lord
Oxford and Cambridge Universities—Inquiry into Endowment, etc., proposed, *July 24*, 1539–1543.

Ellis, Mr. J. E. [Nottingham, Rushcliffe]
- Agricultural Board, Accommodation for, *July 24*, 1563.
- Finance Bill, *Con.*, *July 16*, 556.
- Income Tax—Notices of Assessment in England and Scotland, *July 16*, 556.
- Schools—Transfer Statistics, *July 23*, 1327.

Emigration and Immigration
- Scottish Emigration Statistics.
  - *Qs.* Mr. J. D. White; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 22*, 1172, 1312.
- Statistics for 1907.
  - *Q.* Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *July 23*, 1362.

Employment of Children Act
- Bylaws—Return Presented, *July 15*, 301.

Erroll, Earl of
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep.*, *July 18*, 828; 3R., *July 23*, 1300.

Esher, Viscount
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep.*, *July 18*, 813–815, 822.

Estimates
- [*See also titles*, Army Estimates, Civil Service Estimates *and* Navy Estimates].
- Scottish Estimates, Discussion of
  - *Q.* Mr. Watt; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 15*, 304.
- Supplementary—Date of Issue.
  - *Q.* Mr. Hay; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 23*, 1364.

Evans, Mr. S. T. [Glamorganshire, Mid.]
- Education
  - Grants, Number and Nature of, *July 11*, 87.
  - School Repair—Powers of Local Authorities, *July 11*, 85.
  - Secondary Education—New Regulations issued, *July 11*, 82–88.
  - Training College Hostels—Government Policy, *July 11*, 82–85.

Everett, Mr. R. L. [Suffolk, Woodbridge]
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 721.

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill
- *c. Com.*, *July 17*, 712; *July 22*, 1230; *July 23*, 1375; *July 24*, 1601.
  - *Rep.* July 24*, 1723.
- Amendment omitted from Record in "Votes and Proceedings."
  - *Os.* Mr. Mooney, Mr. J. Redmond, *July 23*, 1371; Mr. Speaker, 1371, 1372; Mr. Clancy, Mr. Moore, 1372.

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill—*cont.*
- *Debates in Committee* [Commons], *July 17*, 712; *July 22*, 1230; *July 23*, 1375; *July 24*, 1601.
  - Amount of Land required
    - Limiting Powers of Commissioner, as to acquisition of Lands proposed, 712–715, 724–766.
    - Record to be kept, proposed, 1232–1234.
    - Total Amount not to exceed 80,000 Acres, proposed, 1232–1244.
  - Compensation, Court of Arbitration to determine, proposed, 1657–1674.
  - Compulsory Acquisition of land, 718, 727–766, 769–806, 1192, 1210, 1218–1220, 1239.
    - Owner to be offered fair Market Value, proposed, 1230–1231.
  - Confining Operation of the Bill to Persons Domiciled in Ireland, proposed, 1376–1388.
  - Estates Commissioners cannot refuse to declare Tenanted Lands an Estate by reason of Owner not Agreeing to Sell an Untenanted Portion, proposed, 1247–1266.
  - Existing Tenants, Proposals as to Ejectment of, 727–766, 1219, 1425–1429.
  - Government Amendments, 1693, 1697, 1701, 1709, 1711, 1715.
  - Land Subject to an Annuity to the Land Commission, Exemption of, proposed, 1601–1603.
  - Limiting to Persons "who have prior to this date been determined to be fit and proper Persons to become Purchasers," proposed, 1409–1416.
  - Necessity for the Measure, 1192, 1200, 1201, 1204, 1205, 1217.
  - "New Tenant Purchasers," Inclusion of, 1429–1451.
  - New Tenants
    - Buildings, etc., as New Holdings to be Suitable, proposed, 1652-1654.
    - Choice of Farms for proposed, 1677–1684.
    - Determination of Tenancy in six months from the Gale Day next after Service of Notice, proposed, 1629–1632.
    - Land Acquired from—Notice to Quit to be served on Occupier, within Three Years, proposed, 1635–1648.
    - Offer of New Parcel of Land to within Three Months, proposed, 1651.
  - Number of Tenants to be Reinstated, 712–716, 724, 739, 741, 1238, 1241, 1243.

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill—*cont.*
Debates in Committee [Commons]—*cont.*
Persons Interested to receive Full Notice, proposed, 1603-1612.
"Provided that such Persons have been Evicted for Non-payment of Rent," proposed, 1419-1425.
Public Hearing of all Parties Interested, proposed, 1391-1405.
Tenants Evicted since 1903, Extending Benefits of Act to, proposed, 1269-1276.
Twelve Months Notice to Quit, proposed, 1615-1626.
Expenses Resolution, (Mr. Birrell), *July 23*, 1471.
Resolution Reported, *July 24*, 1601,
Procedure (Allocation of Time) Resolution (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman) *July 22*, 1192.
Allotted Days, 1194.
Clauses 1 and 2 and Committee Stage of Financial Resolution, Time for, 1193.
Closure, Powers of Chairman as to, 1194.
Dilatory Motions, Procedure as to, 1195, 1199, 1210.
Practice of Fettering Discussion by Guillotine Resolutions, 1195-1198, 1202, 1203, 1207-1209, 1213-1215, 1217.
Report Stage, 1193.
Report Stage of Financial Resolution and remaining Clauses in Committee, time for, 1193.
Third Reading Stage, 1194.

Evictions
See under Ireland

Exchequer and Audit Department
Colonial Audit Branch, Clerks employed in.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 24*, 1566, 1567.
Colonial Inspection Tour, Necessity for.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 18*, 898.

Explosives
Kynochs, Messrs, Use of Mercuric Chloride by Terms of Agreement with Home Office.
Qs. Mr. A. Douglas, *July 18*, 984, 999.

Exports and Imports
Revenue raised from certain Imports.
Q. Mr. Hunt; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 15*, 326.

Faber, Captain W. V.
Army
Morris Tube Cartridges available for use, *July 16*, 525.
Pensions, Period for Paying, *July 16*, 524.

Faber, Captain W. V.—*cont.*
Canadian Steamship Communication with Germany, *July 16*, 532.
Navy—"Blake" and "Blenheim," Proposals as to, *July 22*, 1156.
Parliamentary Relations between Lords and Commons—Legislative Proposals, *July 23*, 1369.
Somaliland — Allowances of Political Officers, *July 23*, 1347.
Transvaal
Chinese Labour Repatriation, Cost of, *July 23*, 1325.
Loan of £5,000,000—Transvaal Bill, Proposals as to, *July 23*, 1347, 1348.

Faber, Mr. G. D. [York]
Navy
Channel Fleet, Strength of, *July 15*, 311; *July 18*, 909.
Submarines, Contracts for, *July 15*, 310, 311; *July 18*, 908, 909.

Factories and Workshops
Accidents
Increase in, Causes of.
Qs. Mr. Gladstone, *July 18*, 933, 934; Mr. H. J. Tennant, 964.
Report giving Preliminary Statistics.
Qs. Mr. Gladstone, *July 18*, 938.
Benzine-poisoning, Scheduled as Industrial Disease.
Qs. Mr. Gladstone, *July 18*, 935.
Bronzing in Lithographic Factories, Special Regulations for, Proposed.
Qs. Mr. H. J. Tennant, *July 18*, 967.
Committee Report Presented, *July 15*, 262, 302.
Electrical Generating Works, Special Regulations for.
Qs. Mr. H. J. Tennant, *July 18*, 965, 966; Mr. H. Samuel, 978.
Fibrosis of the Lungs, Scheduling as an Industrial Disease, proposed.
Qs. Mr. H. Samuel, *July 18*, 977.
Home Work — Committee of Inquiry, Constitution and Terms of Reference.
Qs. Mr. J. R. Macdonald, *July 18*, 953, 954; Mr. Gladstone, 954.
Inspectors
Assistant
Examinations.
Qs. Mr. J. R. Macdonald, *July 18*, 956.
Improvement in *status* of.
Qs. Mr. Gladstone, *July 18*, 938; Mr. J. R. Macdonald, 954, 955; Mr. H. Samuel, 979.
Inquests, Attendance at.
Qs. Mr. J. R. Macdonald, *July 18*, 954.

[cont.

Factories and Workshops—*cont.*
Inspectors—*cont.*
Class of Men Appointed and Tests Imposed on.
Os. Mr. J. R. Macdonald, *July 18*, 958, 980; Mr. H. J. Tennant, 963; Mr. H. Samuel, 980.
Increase in Number of.
Os. Mr. Gladstone, *July 18*, 938-940.
Reports of, Particulars given in.
Q. Mr. C. Money; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 15*, 331.
Visits Made and Number of Miles Travelled, Lack of Information.
Os. Mr. J. R. Macdonald, *July 18*, 957; Mr. H. Samuel, 978.
Label-licking, Prohibition of, proposed.
Qs. Mr. C. Money, Viscount Turnour; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 15*, 332, 333.
Medical Officers, Inspection by.
Qs. Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 18*, 919–922.
Particulars Orders, Cases of Non-compliance with.
Q. Mr. A. Henderson; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 15*, 330.
Religious and Charitable Workshops, Application of Act to.
Q. Mr. A. Henderson; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 15*, 329, 330.
Report of Chief Inspector.
Os. Mr. Gladstone, *July 18*, 932, 933.
Shuttles made of West African Wood, Poisoning added to Schedule of Industrial Diseases.
Os. Mr. Gladstone, *July 18*, 934.
Time-cribbing, progress made with Suppression of.
Os. Mr. Gladstone, *July 18*, 935; 1003; Mr. Shackleton, 971–975; Mr. H. Samuel, 975.
Women Workers, Fines on.
Q. Mr. Byles; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 15*, 331.

Farrell, Mr. J. P. [Longford, N.]
Douglas Estate, Sale of, *July 16*, 518.
Irish Public Works Loan, *July 16*, 515.
Newtownforbes Meeting, Police Presence at, *July 16*, 517.
Potato Crop, Condition of, *July 16*, 518.

Feeble-minded Persons
Statistics for the United Kingdom.
Q. Mr. J. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 1367.

Fell, Mr. A. [Great Yarmouth]
Army—Irvine Moor Sham Fight, Casualties at, *July 22*, 1159.
Calcutta — Form of Queen Victoria Memorial, *July 15*, 318.

Fell, Mr. A.—*cont.*
Colonial Loans—Precedent for Imperial Guarantee, *July 23*, 1359.
Evictions—Age of Applicants for Reinstatement, *July 22*, 1135.
Finance Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 174–176.; *Con.*, *July 16*, 573, 576, 582, 599.
Home Fleet, Evolutions of, *July 22*, 1157.
Income Tax
Companies or Corporations to be assessed only in respect of Profits distributed among Shareholders, proposed, *July 11*, 174–176.
Earned Incomes, Inclusion of Pensions and Annuities, *July 16*, 599.
Incomes which have already paid Tax in the Colonies, Exemption of, proposed, *July 16*, 582.
Limited Liability Companies, deduction of Expenses of flotation, *July 16*, 573, 576.
Land Values under existing Contracts, *July 15*, 326.
Malta Torpedo-boat Flotilla, Strength of, *July 22*, 1157; *July 15*, 314.
Merchant Shipping—All-British Line, *July 22*, 1173.
Morocco—Reason for Capture of Kaid Sir H. Maclean, *July 23*, 1359.
Post Office Sites Bill, *Com.*, *July 19*, 1038, 1043, 1046.
Transvaal—Labour for the Mines
Replacement of Vacancies caused by Repatriation of Chinese, *July 15*, 320.
Report of Committee, *July 23*, 1353.

Ferens, Mr. T. R. [Hull, E.]
County Court Fees, *July 16*, 540.

Ferguson, Mr. R. C. M. [Leith Burghs]
Finance Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 557.
Forestry in Argyle and Forest of Dean, *July 18*, 907.
Income Tax — Notices of Assessment, assimilating Procedure as to in England and Scotland, *July 16*, 557.
Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *July 16*, 607–610.
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, Holdings excluded from, *July 23*, 1332.

Fermoy
Relieving Officer, Case of.
Qs. Capt. Craig, Mr. C. Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 24*, 1589, 1590.

Ferro-Concrete
Loans for Construction—Period of Repayment.
Q. Mr. Whitehead; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 15*, 333.

Field, Mr. W. [Dublin, St. Patrick]
Colonial Audit Branch, Clerks employed in, *July 24*, 1566.
Exchequer and Audit Department—Necessity for Colonial Inspection Tour, *July 18*, 898.
Government Department Clerks, Information as to, *July 22*, 1153, 1155.
Land Commission Clerks—Pay, Promotion, and Classification, *July 22*, 1151-1153.
Land Purchase—Mineral Rights, *July 22*, 1152.
Local Government Board—Promotion of Messrs. Jenkins, Monsell, and Eckersley, *July 22* 1152.
War Office—Allowances to Clerical Staffs, *July 23*, 1311.

Fiji
Sale of Lands in Provinces of Rewa and Naitasiri, Circumstances of—Tabling Correspondence relating to, proposed.
Os. Lord Stanmore, *July 16*, 473–480, 483 ; Earl of Elgin, 480–483.
Correspondence Presented, *July 18*, 810.

Finance Bill
c. Com., July 11, 157.
Rep. July 11*, 191.
Con., July 16, 550.

First Commissioner of Works
Rt. Hon. L. Harcourt.

First Lord of the Admiralty
Lord Tweedmouth.

First Lord of the Treasury
Rt. Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.

Fiscal Policy
Colonial Preference, *see that title.*
Food Taxation, Objections to.
Os. Mr. Soares, *July 15*, 376-386 ; Mr. Simon, 386-392 ; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 389 ; Mr. Chaplin, 413–419 ; Mr. Lloyd-George, 437, 441-443 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 448-452 ; Mr. Asquith, 458.
Labour Party Attitude.
Os. Mr. Curran, *July 15*, 426–430.
Trade and Commerce, Growth of, under a Free Trade System.
Os. Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 15*, 438, 439.

Fish-curing
Sanitary Conditions of Work.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *July 18*, 950 ; Mr. H. Samuel, 977.

Fisheries
Ireland—Protection of North Coast.
Q. Mr. Barrie ; *A.* T. W. Russell, *July 22*, 1183, 1184.

Fisheries—*cont.*
Scotland
Board Superannuation Scheme.
Q. Mr. Lamont ; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 12*, 197.
Protection afforded by Gunboats.
Q. Mr. Power ; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 22*, 1182.

Flavin, Mr. M. J. [Kerry, N.]
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com., July 23*, 1382.
Listowel Land Commission Sittings, *July 11*, 58.
Soldiers, Civil Employment of, *July 23*, 1343.

Fleetwood (Victoria Pier Order) Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 11*, 1.

Fletcher, Mr. J. S. [Hampstead]
Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con., July 23*, 1493.

Florists
Hours of Labour.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *July 18*, 951.

Flynn, Mr. J. C. [Cork, N.]
Agriculture Department, Horse-breeding Schemes, *July 24*, 1587.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com., July 22*, 1257 ; *July 23*, 1378.
Kanturk Extra Police—Case of Mr. Daly, *July 24*, 1587–1589.
Land Purchase—Case of Mr. J. Philpott, *July 24*, 1564.

Fordyce
Academy—Cause for Dismissal of Rector.
Q. Mr. McCrae ; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 15*, 338.

Foreign Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Sir E. Grey.
Under-Secretary—Lord Fitzmaurice.
Vote, Discussion of.
Qs. Mr. Lynch, Mr. John Robertson, Mr. Rees, Sir G. Parker ; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 16*, 546, 547.

Forest Hall
Pilot's Claim for Salvage.
Q. Mr. Boland ; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 11*, 58, 59.

Forest of Dean
Forest Officer, Appointment of.
Q. Mr. M. Ferguson ; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 18*, 907.

Forster, Mr. H. W. [Kent, Sevenoaks]
Finance Bill, *Con., July 16*, 579.
Incomes of Married Persons, assessing separately, proposed, *July 16*, 579.

Forster, Mr. H. W.—*cont.*
  Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con., July 23*, 1523.
  Post Office Sites Bill, *Com., July 19*, 1042.
  Radiotelegraphic Report, Discussion of, *July 18*, 931.

Fortescue, Earl
  Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep., July 18*, 811, 826, 827, 848.

Forthill
  Burial Ground, Condition of.
    Q. Mr. C. Craig ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 24*, 1565.

Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir H. H.—*Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster* [Wolverhampton, E.]
  High Court of Justice, State of Business in, Necessity for Appointment of Addition Judge, etc., *July 12*, 221.

France
  Telegraph and Telephone charges to.
    Q. Sir E. Sassoon ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 11*, 48.
  Trade Reports Presented, *July 22*, 1080.

Fruit-preserving Industry
  Hours of Labour.
    Os. Mr. Gladstone, *July 18*, 935 ; Sir C. Dilke, 950 ; Mr. H. Samuel, 976.

Galapagos Islands
  British Negro Subjects employed in.
    Q. Major Anstruther-Gray ; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 18*, 914, 915.

Gardner, Mr. E. [Berkshire, Wokingham.]
  Workmen's Compensation Act—Insurance Powers of Local Authorities, *July 18*, 924.

Gas Light and Coke Company
  Meter Rents charged.
    Q. Mr. Thorne ; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 22*, 1174.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill
  c. Rep. * *July 11*, 34.
  3R.* *July 12*, 193.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill
  c. 2R.* *July 23*, 193.

Geneva Convention
  Cuba, Dominican Republic, Hayti and Paraguay, Accession of—Copy Presented, *July 17*, 662 ; *July 18*, 809.

Giggleswick and Rathmell
  Charities, Administration of.
    Q. Mr. Clough ; *A.* Mr. Trevelyan, *July 23*, 1364.

Ginnell, Mr. L. [Westmeath, N.]
  British Museum Literary Section, Cost of, etc., *July 17*, 674.
  Evictions, Rejected Reinstatement Claims, *July 17*, 669.
  Irish Departments, Return as to, proposed, *July 16*, 519.
  Land Judges Court—Estates which Commission propose to Purchase, *July 17*, 668.

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. J.—*Secretary of State for the Home Department* [Leeds, W.]
  Accidents, Fatal, reported in 1904–6, *July 17*, 666.
  Aliens, Expulsion of Undesirables, *July 18*, 1000.
  Anthrax, Increase in, Causes of, *July 18*, 934.
  Bach, Albert, Case of, *July 16*, 538.
  Benzene-poisoning Scheduled as Industrial Disease, *July 18*, 935.
  Burial Grounds, Private, Legality of, *July 16*, 539.
  Cabs, Horse-drawn—Use of Taximeters, *July 15*, 329 ; *July 22*, 1169.
  Chester—Case of T. Bowden, *July 17*, 690, 691.
  Children Employed on Half-time, *July 15*, 331.
    Operation Order No. 680, *July 16*, 538.
  Commissions, Work entailed by, *July 18*, 936, 237.
  Dartmoor Prison—Sentences on certain Prisoners, *July 17*, 687–690.
  Dock Inspection, Improved System of, *July 18*, 935.
  Edalji Case, Circumstances of, Authorship of Anonymous Letters, etc., *July 18*, 1017.
  Factories and Workshops
    Accidents
      Increase in, Cause of, *July 18*, 933, 934-
      Report giving Preliminary Statistics, *July 18*, 938.
    Fines on Women Workers, *July 15*, 331.
    Home Work—Committee of Inquiry, Constitution of, *July 18*, 954.
    Inspectors
      Assistant, Improvement in *status* of, *July 18*, 938.
      Increase in number of, *July 18*, 938–940.
      Reports, Particulars given in, *July 15*, 331.

[*cont.*

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. J.—*cont.*
- Factories and Workshops—*cont.*
  - Label-licking in, *July 15*, 332–333.
  - Medical Officers, Inspections by, *July 18*, 919–922.
  - Particulars Orders, Cases of non-compliance with, *July 15*, 330.
  - Religious and Charitable Workshops, Application of Act to, *July 15*, 330.
  - Report of Chief Inspector, *July 18*, 932–933.
  - Shuttles made of West African Wood, Poisoning added to Schedule, *July 18*, 934.
  - Time-cribbing, Progress made with Suppression of, *July 18*, 935, 1003.
- Fruit-preserving Industry — Hours of Labour, *July 18*, 935.
- Guernsey Company Law, *July 24*, 1581.
- Hackney Carriage Act, Amendment of, *July 15*, 329.
- Hungerford Justices Clerk, Fines and Fees Collected by, *July 24*, 1582.
- Lead Poisoning Increase in Cases—Enforcement of Regulations, and use of Leadless Glaze, *July 18*, 1001, 1002.
- Lunacy—Case of R. Coles, *July 22*, 1170.
- Lynch Case—Reason for granting Pardon, *July 15*, 328.
- Mines
  - Eight Hours Day—Legislative Proposals, *July 18*, 933, 1000.
  - Inspectorate, Proposed Changes, *July 18*, 933.
  - Letter sent by Mr. J. M. Ronaldson, *July 15*, 328.
  - Medal for Life-saving, Establishment of, *July 18*, 933.
  - Rescue Appliances, Provision of, *July 18*, 1003.
- Motor Accidents during 1905 and 1906, *July 23*, 1330.
- Nurses, Registration of, *July 16*, 539.
- Phosphorus Substitutes in the Match Trade, Making use of compulsory, *July 18*, 941, 942, 1000.
- Police, Metropolitan
  - Commission Report, Date of issuing, *July 18*, 1000.
  - Study of Yiddish, *July 22*, 1170.
- Prisons
  - Chains and Cross-irons, Prisoners wearing, *July 24*, 1583.
  - Flogging in, *July 23*, 1360.
  - Weak-Minded Prisoners, Treatment of, *July 22*, 1170.
- Rate Collection — Cost of Legal Proceedings, *July 23*, 1329.
- Regulations and Orders issued by the Home Office, *July 18*, 937, 938.

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. J.—*cont.*
- Sunderland Hairdressers' Application for Closing Order, *July 18*, 922.
- Trachoma, Measures taken to check, *July 17*, 691.
- Vivisection—Report of Royal Commission, *July 18*, 1000, 1001.
- Vote, Date fixed for Discussion of, *July 18*, 952.
- Welshpool Burial Ground, *July 24*, 1581–1582.
- West Ham—Case of W. Page, *July 18*, 919.
- Workmens' Compensation Act
  - Aged Workmen, Effect on Employment of, *July 18*, 923.
  - Epileptics, Effect on Employment of *July 15*, 327.
- Youthful Offenders Bill, Facilities for, *July 11*, 36.

Glasgow
- Schools—Report on Physical Condition of Children Presented, *July 24*, 1525, 1562.

Gloucester
- Pilotage Dues.
  - *Q.* Mr. Hicks Beach; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 16*, 539, 540.

Goff Estate
- Toneroe Portion, Sale of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 16*, 544, 545.

Gold and Silver Plate
- Removal of, to Assay Office, Regulation as to.
  - *Os.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 11*, 188.

Gooseberry Mildew
- Measures for Dealing with.
  - *Q.* Mr. Beck; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 18*, 902.

Gortnakillue
- Reinstatement Claim by Mr. Brady.
  - *Q.* Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 1333.

Gorton
- Postmistress, Pension Claim of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Hodge; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 23*, 1332.

Government Departments
- [*See also names of Departments as* Post Office, etc.]
- Clerks, Information as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 1153.
  - *Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 22*, 1155, 1156.
- Clothing Contracts, Terms of.
  - *Os.* Mr. Summerbell, *July 18*, 970.

Government Departments—*cont.*
- Irish Departments—Return as to Cost, Income and Expenditure proposed. *Q.* Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 16*, 519.

Granard, Earl of
- Companies (Consolidated) Bill, 2R., *July 23*, 1284.
- Imported Watch Cases Bill, 2R., *July 15*, 267.
- Limited Partnerships Bill, *Rep.*, *July 16*, 469–472.
- Pyrotechnic Morse Code, Decision as to Use of in the Navy, *July 15*, 264.

Great Central Railway Bill
- *c.* Lords' Amendts., *Con.** *July 12*, 193.

Great Northern and City Railway Bill
- *c.* Lords' Amendt., *Con.** *July 12*, 193.

Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill
- *c.* *Con.** *July 15*, 299.
- 3R.* *July 18*, 893.
- *l.* Commons' Amendts.,* *July 22*, 1077.

Greenwich Hospital
- Director, Salary of—Order Presented, *July 22*, 1081, 1128.

Gretton, Mr. [Rutland]
- Defence of Home Waters, Responsibility for, *July 23*, 1339.
- Finance Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 559–561, 562.
- Land Tax Commissioners appointed, *July 24*, 1584.
- Navy
  - "Blake" and "Blenheim," Armament, of, *July 11*, 40, 41.
  - Guns Damaged in Action, Replacement of, *July 24*, 1571.
  - "Renown," Fittings of, *July 23*, 1338.
- Post Office Sites Bill, *Com.*, *July 19*, 1033, 1041, 1044.
- School Building Grant, Allocation of, *July 24*, 1584.
- Sugar Duty, Reduction of, on British and Colonial Sugar, proposed, *July 16*, 559–562.
- Telegraph (Money) Bill, *Con.*, *July 12*, 249; *July 19*, 1032.

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.—*Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs* [Northumberland, Berwick]
- Africa, West—Labour in San Thomé and Principé, *July 18*, 916.
- Baghdad Customs Arrangements, *July 11*, 46.
- China Concessions, Negotiations as to, *July 18*, 914.

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.—*cont.*
- Congo Free State, Imports by Way of the Nile, *July 23*, 1354.
- Consular Reports, Weights, etc., Used in, *July 18*, 897.
- Egypt
  - Bemba, Turkish Troops in, *July 23*, 1357.
  - Census, Taking of, *July 16*, 534.
  - Educational Posts, Egyptians in, *July 18*, 915.
  - Government Officials, Salaries of, *July 23*, 1355.
  - Khedivial School of Law, Evening Classes, *July 16*, 536.
    - Rectorship of, *July 16*, 535; *July 23*, 1358.
  - Plague, Deaths from, *July 11*, 44.
  - Postal Rates, *July 18*, 914; *July 23*, 1357.
  - Regent, Identity of, *July 23*, 1357.
  - State Railways and Telegraphs Expenditure, *July 23*, 1355.
- Galapagos Islands, British Negro Subjects employed in, *July 18*, 914, 915.
- Hague Conference
  - International Limitation of Armaments, *July 23*, 1358.
  - Private Property at Sea, Protection of, *July 11*, 46, 47.
- Macedonian Outrages, Punishments for, *July 11*, 44.
- Morocco—Capture of Kaid Sir H. Maclean, *July 23*, 1359.
- Newfoundland Fisheries — Negotiations with United States, *July 11*, 45; *July 18*, 915, 916.
- Persia—Anglo-Russian Negotiations, *July 11*, 46; *July 16*, 534.
- Portugal—Terms of Treaty of August, 1890, *July 12*, 196.
- Russia—Assault on Mr. T. Hutchinson at Odessa, *July 18*, 916.
- Russo-Japanese War — "Knight Commander" Case, *July 16*, 533.
- Soudan—Nile Bridge at Khartoum, *July 23*, 1355.
- Turkey
  - Abbott's, Mr., Ransom, *July 16*, 533, 534.
  - Customs Increase, Revenue from, *July 23*, 1354, 1356.

Guernsey
- Company Law in. *Q.* Mr. H. H. Marks; *A* Mr. Gladstone, *July 24*, 1580, 1581.

Gulland, Mr. J. W. [Dumfries Burghs]
- Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *July 16*, 615-817.
- Workmen's Compensation Act—Effect on Employment of Epileptics, *July 15*, 327.

Gurdon, Sir W. B. [Norfolk, N.]
- Finance Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 572.
- Income-tax on Earned Incomes — Landowner Farming his own Land, Inclusion of, proposed, *July 16*, 572.

Gwynn, Mr. [Galway]
- Agriculture Department, Working of—Cost of Inquiry, *July 24*, 1564.
- Radiotelegraphic Report, Discussion of, *July 18*, 931.
- Wireless Telegraphy—Discussion of Radiotelegraphic Convention Report, *July 11*, 62.

Hackney Carriage Act, 1869
- Amendment Proposals.
  - *Q.* Mr. Straus; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 15*, 329.

Hague Conference
- British Delegates, Instructions to.
  - *Q* Mr. King; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 24*, 1580.
- International Limitation of Armaments, Proposals for.
  - *Q.* Mr. S. Roberts; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 23*, 1358.
  - *Q.* Sir G. Parker; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 24*, 1597.
- Private Property at Sea, Attitude towards Protection of
  - *Qs.* Mr. Alden, Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 11*, 46, 47.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*Secretary of State for War* [Haddington]
- Ammunition
  - Defective, Withdrawal of, *July 15*, 316.
  - Smokeless Blank Cartridges, Provision of, *July 18*, 910.
- Anti-typhoid Inoculation Statistics, *July 23*, 1334.
- Armour-piercing Projectiles, Inventor of Cap for, *July 12*, 197.
- Artillery
  - Reductions under New Scheme, *July 22*, 1161-1163.
  - Strength of, *July 17*, 682.
- Band—Condition of Engagement at Southgate, *July 15*, 318; *July 22*, 1163.
- Cavalry for Scotland, *July 15*, 316.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*cont.*
- Civil Service Pensions—Counting of Military Service, *July 22*, 1139.
- Irvine Moor Sham Fight, Casualties at, *July 22*, 1159.
- Maryhill Barracks, Use for, *July 15*, 317.
- Militia
  - Frozen Beef supplied to, *July 12*, 198.
  - Special Contingent, Inducements to join, *July 16*, 525.
- Morris Tube Cartridges available for use, *July 16*, 525.
- Officers
  - Parliamentary Candidature, Regulations as to, *July 18*, 910, 911.
  - Staff Officers, Emoluments of, *July 24*, 1569.
- Pensions, Period for Paying, *July 16*, 524, 525.
- Queen's Barracks, Perth—Mess Accommodation, *July 15*, 314.
- St. Helena
  - Roads, Maintenance of, *July 15*, 317.
  - War Office Property, Care of, *July 15*, 315.
- Territorial Force
  - Colours for, *July 15*, 315.
  - Strength of, *July 22*, 1160, 1161.
- Volunteers
  - Devonshire Regiments—Conveyance to Camp, *July 16*, 520.
  - Essex Royal Garrison Artillery, Armament of, *July 15*, 307.
  - Railway Fares of Officers, *July 17*, 681.
  - Reduction Proposals, *July 22*, 1159.
- War Office
  - Clerical Staff, Allowances to, *July 23*, 1313.
  - Clothing Contracts placed with Irish, Scottish and Welsh Firms, *July 17*, 679; *July 22*, 1159; *July 23*, 1322; *July 24*, 1569.
  - Meat Contracts, System of Placing, *July, 18*, 906.
- Woolwich
  - Reinforced Concrete used at, *July 22*, 1138.
  - Threat of Strike at, *July 15*, 317.
- Yeomanry
  - Armament of, *July 22*, 1138.
  - Officers—Shortage in London Regiments, *July 15*, 307.

Halpin, Mr. J. [Clare, W.]
- Agriculture Department, Encouragement to Dairy Industry, *July 22*, 1183.
- Clare—Extra Police, Charge for, *July 16*, 544.

[*cont.*

Halpin, Mr. J.—*cont.*

Doonass Property — Case of Mrs. M. Shearin, *July 24*, 1592.

Milk, Irish — Facilities for sending to England, *July 15*, 340.

Halsbury, Earl of.

Advertisements Regulation Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 27.

Hamilton of Dalzell, Lord

Qualification of Women (County and Town Councils) (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *July 15*, 264; *Com.*, *July 22*, 1086.

Vaccination (Scotland) Bill, Date of Second Reading, *July 22*, 1124.

Hampden, Viscount

Cavalry, Divisional, Adequacy of proposed Training, *July 17*, 658.

Harcourt, Rt. Hon. L.—*First Commissioner of Works* [Lancashire, N.E., Rossendale]

Agriculture Board, Accommodation for, *July 11*, 37; *July 24*, 1564.

Blackpool Post Office, Erection of, *July 24*, 1568.

General Post Office—Construction of New Building, *July 15*, 336.

Law Courts—Accommodation in Royal Courts of Justice, *July 18*, 902.

Mall—Erection of Electric Light Standards, *July 22*, 1181.

Hardinge, Viscount

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep.*, *July 18*, 861–865.

Hardy, Mr. G. A. [Suffolk, Stowmarket]

London County Council (General Powers) Bill, *Con.*, *July 11*, 125.

Hardy, Mr. L. [Kent, Ashford]

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill—Allocation of Time, *July 22*, 1202.

Finance Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 167.

Income-tax—Deduction for Cost of Insurance and Expenses of Management, *July 11*, 167.

St. Helena—Care of War Department Property, *July 15*, 315.

Harmood-Banner, Mr. J. S. [Liverpool, Everton]

Finance Bill, *Con.*, *July 16*, 574, 581, 637–639.

Income-tax

  Incomes which have already paid Tax in the Colonies, Exemption of, proposed, *July 16*, 581.

  Limited Liability Companies, Deduction of Expenses of Flotation, *July 16*, 574.

  Three Years Average System, Working of, *July 16*, 637–639.

Harmood-Banner, Mr. J. S.—*cont.*

India—Arracan Capitation Tax, *July 16*, 531.

Supply, Discussion of, *July 16*, 547.

Harris, Mr. Leverton [Tower Hamlets, Stepney]

Artillery

  Reductions under New Scheme, *July 22*, 1163.

  Strength of, *July 17*, 682.

Corn Duty, Revenue derived from, *July 22*, 1132.

Finance Bill, *Con.*, *July 16*, 582.

Incomes which have already paid Tax in the Colonies, Exemption of from Tax, proposed, *July 16*, 582.

Navy — Battleships and Cruisers with Nucleus Crews, Complements of, *July 15*, 313.

Tea Duty

  Contribution per head (1906–7), *July 17*, 687.

  Irish Contribution, *July 22*, 1131.

Trachoma, Measures taken to Check, *July 17*, 691.

Woolwich, Threat of Strike at, *July 15*, 317.

Hart-Davies, Mr. T. [Hackney, N.]

Newfoundland Fisheries — Negotiations with United States, *July 11*, 45.

Nurses, Registration of, *July 16*, 539.

Russo-Japanese War — "Knight Commander" Case, *July 16*, 533.

Harvey, Mr. W. E. [Derby, N.E.]

Elementary Schools, Policy as to, *July 11*, 90–92.

Haversham, Lord

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 3R., *July 23*, 1290–1292, 1301.

Hay, Mr. C. G. D. [Shoreditch, Hoxton]

Africa, East—Rupees used in—Profit from Coining, etc., *July 23*, 1324, 1352.

Army—Queen's Barracks, Perth—Mess Accommodation, *July 15*, 314; *July 23*, 1342.

Cardboard Boxes — Import Regulations, *July 15*, 336.

Civil Service

  Boy Clerks, Position of, *July 15*, 337.

  Clerical Appointment System, Revision of, *July 18*, 896.

Estimates, Supplementary—Date of Issue, *July 23*, 1364.

Finance Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 185, 186, 187, 188.

Income tax, Payments in respect of the Workmen's Compensation Act, Exemption of, Proposed, *July 11*, 185.

[*cont.*

Hay, Mr. C. G. D.—*cont.*
Indian Rupees, Coinage of, *July 24*, 1577.
Merchant Shipping—All British Line, *July 22*, 1173.
Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill, *Con., July 24*, 1723, 1751.
Stamp Duty on Marine Insurance Policies, Reduction of Scale for, Proposed, *July 11*, 187, 188.
Transvaal—Rupees, Payment of Mining Wages in, Proposed, *July 23*, 1353.

Hayden, Mr. J. P. [Roscommon, S.]
Goff Estate — Sale of Toneroe Portion, *July 16*, 544.
Income Tax Assessment of Occupiers of Land in Ireland, *July 23*, 1359.
Irish Public Works Loans, *July 16*, 537.

Hazel, Dr. A. E. W. [West Bromwich]
Weights and Measures Acts — Issue of Regulations, *July 22*, 1149.

Hazleton, Mr. R. [Galway, N.]
Dartmoor Prison—Sentences on Certain Prisoners, *July 17*, 689.
Pollock Estate, Sale of, *July 22*, 1154.
Prisoners wearing Chains and Cross-irons, *July 24*, 1582.

Healy, Mr. T. M. [Louth, N.]
Africa, East—Visit of Under-Secretary, *July 24*, 1580.
Business of the House, Course of, *July 23*, 1373.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com., July 17*, 748-751, 803-805; *July 23*, 1399, 1422, 1433, 1436-1438; *July 24*, 1602, 1605, 1607, 1609, 1618, 1622, 1641, 1645-1648, 1670, 1679, 1684.

Heaton, Mr. J. H. [Canterbury]
Telephone Connections for Post Offices, *July 15*, 307.
War Office Meat Contracts, Australian Tenders for, *July 18*, 906.

Helme, Mr. N. W. [Lancashire, N., Lancaster]
Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill, *Con., July 24*, 1739.
Telegraph (Money) Bill, *Con., July 12*, 255.

Henderson, Mr. A. [Durham, Barnard Castle]
Admiralty Foundry Contracts—Inspection of Work, *July 16*, 523.
Factories
  Particulars, Orders, Cases of Non-compliance with, *July 15*, 330.
  Religious, etc., Workshops, Application of Act to, *July 15*, 329.
"King Edward VII.," Rudder of—Inspection System, *July 23*, 1337.
Wages in Foreign Countries, *July 15*, 333.

Henderson, Mr. J. McD. [Aberdeenshire, W.]
Finance Bill, *Con., July 16*, 552.
Income Tax—Notices of Assessment, Assimilating Procedure as to, in England and Scotland, *July 16*, 552.
Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *July 16*, 601-604.

Heneage, Lord
Crown Estates converted into Small Holdings, Alleged Dispossession of Tenants, *July 16*, 498–502.

Herbert, Mr. T. A. [Buckinghamshire, Wycombe]
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com., July 23*, 1424.
India—Case of Eital Praesad, *July 17*, 679.
Law Courts—Accommodation in Royal Courts of Justice, *July 18*, 902.

Hereford, Bishop of
Oxford and Cambridge Universities—Inquiry into Endowment, Administration, and Teaching, proposed. *July 24*, 1543–1547.

Hervey, Captain F. W. F. [Bury St. Edmunds]
Finance Bill, *Con., July 16*, 570–571.
Income Tax on Earned Incomes—Landowner Farming his own Land, Inclusion of, proposed, *July 16*, 570.

Hill, Sir C. L. [Shrewsbury]
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com., July 23*, 1642.

Hill, Viscount
Crown Estates converted into Small Holdings—Returns as to, *July 16*, 496–498, 510.

Hobhouse Mr. C. E. H.—*Under-Secretary for India* [Bristol, E.]
Army Medical Officers, Pay of, *July 15*, 318.
Burma—Stability of Gôkteik Railway Bridge, *July 24*, 1576.
Calcutta—Form of Queen Victoria Memorial, *July 15*, 319.
Postal Employees' Grievances—Date of Presenting Report, *July 16*, 515.
Rupees, Coinage of, *July 24*, 1577.

Hodge, Mr. J. [Lancashire, S.E., Gorton]
Gorton Postmistress, Pension Claim of, *July 23*, 1332.

Hogan, Mr. M. [Tipperary, N.]
Beechwood Park Untenanted Land, Purchase of, *July 24*, 1595.

Holywood
Urban District Council—Case of J. H. Barrett.
Qs. Mr. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *July 11*, 50–53.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 18*, 905, 906.

Home Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. H. Gladstone.
Under-Secretary—Mr. H. Samuel.
Commissions, Work entailed by.
Os. Mr. Gladstone, *July 18*, 936, 937; Mr. A. Douglas, 982.
Regulations and Orders issued and pending.
Os. Mr. Gladstone, *July 18*, 937, 938.
Vote for, *July 18*, 932.
Date fixed for Discussion of.
Os. Mr. J. R. Macdonald, Mr. Gladstone, *July 18*, 952; Mr. Staveley-Hill, Mr. Markham, Mr. J. A. Pease, 1020.
Qs. Mr. Markham; *As.* Sir H Campbell-Bannerman, *July 22*, 1188, 1189.

Hope, Mr. W. H. B. [Somerset, N.]
Bristol Pilot Dues, *July 11*, 47.

House of Commons
See under Parliament.

House of Lords
See under Parliament.

Hudson Estate
Sale Proposals for.
Q. Mr. S. Young; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 18*, 905.

Humber Conservancy Bill
c. Rep. July 15*, 300.
Com. July 22*, 1125.

Hungerford
Justices Clerk, Fines and Fees collected by.
Qs. Mr. Morton; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 24*, 1582.

Hunt, Mr. R. [Shropshire, Ludlow]
Cocoa Duty, Abolution of, proposed, *July 11*, 180–182.
Finance Bill, *Com., July 11*, 180–182.
Import of Certain Goods, Revenue from, *July 15*, 326.
Navy
Battleships and Cruisers with Nucleus Crews, Complements of, *July 15*, 313.
Channel Fleet, Scouts, etc., attached to, *July 15*, 312.

Hunt, Mr. R.—*cont.*
China Station, Destroyers on, *July 23*, 1335.
"Cumberland," Docking of, *July 11*, 37, 38.
"Cumberland" and "New Zealand," Information as to, *July 24*, 1571.
Mediterranean Station, Destroyers on, *July 23*, 1335.
Mobilisation under New Scheme, *July 15*, 311, 312, 314.
Shipbuilding Programme, *July 11*, 38.
Ships in Full Commission (1903-7), *July 23*, 1340.

Imported Watch Cases Bill
l. 2R., *July 15*, 267.
Com. and *Rep.,* July 16*, 473.
Report from Standing Committee, *July 23*, 1283.

Income-tax
Basis of calculating Individual Incomes.
Q. Mr. R. Duncan; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 16*, 536.
British Subjects Resident Abroad, Payment by.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 19*, 1023.
Business or Profession discontinued—Three Years Average Assessment.
Os. Mr. W. Rutherford, *July 16*, 643; Mr. Courthope, 644; Mr. Morton, 645; Mr. Buxton, 645–646; Mr. S. Roberts, Mr. Asquith, Mr. A. Chamberlain, 647.
Companies or Corporations to be assessed only in respect of Profits distributed among Shareholders, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Fell, *July 11*, 174–176; Mr. Asquith, 174–176; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 177.
Deduction for Cost of Insurance and Expenses of Management.
Os. Mr. H. Beach, *July 11*, 157–161, 168; Mr. Asquith, 161, 167; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 162; Mr. Lane-Fox, 163; Mr. Bridgeman, 163–165; Lord Willoughby de Eresby, 165, 167; Mr. L. Hardy, 167.
Dwelling-houses rented by Ministers of Religion, Allowing Deduction for.
Os. Sir A. Spicer, *July 11*, 185; Mr. Asquith, 186.
Earned Incomes
Landowner farming his own Land.
Os. Mr. H. Beach, *July 16*, 568–570, 573; Captain Hervey, 570; Mr. Asquith, 571; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 571; Sir F. Banbury, Sir B. Gurdon, Sir F. Cawley, 572.

[*cont.*

Income-tax—*cont.*

Earned Incomes—*cont.*

Pensions and Annuities, Inclusion of.
Os. Mr. Asquith, *July 16*, 593, 595–600; Mr. Morton, 594; Mr. Smeaton, 594, 595, 597, 599; Mr. Rawlinson, 594, 598; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 594, 601.
Os. Sir S. King, 595; Sir J. Jardine, 596; Mr. T. L. Corbett, 598; Mr. Fell, 599; Sir F. Banbury, 599; Mr. H. Beach, 631–634.

Incomes which have already paid Tax in the Colonies.
Os. Mr. Rawlinson, *July 16*, 579; Mr. Courthope, 580; Mr. Asquith, 580, 581; Sir S. King, 581; Mr. Harmood-Banner, 581; Sir F. Banbury, 581; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 582; Mr. Fell, 582; Mr. L. Harris, 582.

Land in Ireland—Assessment of Occupiers, etc.
Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 23*, 1359, 1360.

Limited Liability Companies, Deduction of Expenses of Flotation.
Os. Mr. Fell, *July 16*, 573, 576; Mr. Harmood-Banner, 574; Mr. Buxton, 574; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 575; Mr. Asquith, 575.

Married Persons, Incomes of.

Adding together for Purpose of Assessment, proposed.
Os. Mr. Rawlinson, *July 11*, 190; Mr. Asquith, 190.

Separate Incomes, Treating as, proposed.
Os. Mr. Rawlinson, *July 16*, 576; Sir F. Banbury, 577; Mr. Asquith, 578; Mr. Foster, 579.

Notices of Assessment—Assimilating Procedure in Great Britain and Ireland.
Os. Mr. C. E. Price, *July 16*, 551, 558; Mr. J. M. Henderson, 552; Mr. Asquith, 553, 557; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 554, 558; Mr. McCrae, 554; Mr. Watt, 555; Mr. Ellis, 556; Mr. Dalziel, 557; Mr. M. Ferguson, 557; Mr. H. Cox, 558.

Relief under New System—Issue of Supplemental Forms.
Q. Mr. E. Cecil; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 18*, 916, 917.

Sewers, Assessment of
Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 16*, 536, 537.

Three Years Average System, Working of.
Os. Sir F. Banbury, *July 16*, 637; Mr. Harmood-Banner, 637–639; Mr. Asquith, 639; Mr. A. Chamberlain, Mr. S. Roberts, Mr. Courthope, 640.

Income-tax—*cont.*

Workmen's Compensation Act, Payments, Exemption of, proposed.
Os. Mr. H. H. Marks, *July 11*, 183–185; Mr. Asquith, 185; Mr. C. Hay, 185.

India

Affairs, Parliamentary Discussion of.
Qs. Sir J. Jardine, Sir H. Cotton; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 23*, 1370, 1371.

Army—Medical Corps Officers, pay of.
Q. Mr. J. Campbell; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 15*, 318.

Arracan Capitation Tax.
Qs. Mr. Harmood-Banner; *As.* Mr. Morley, *July 16*, 531, 532.

Bengal

Ebrahim Munshi, Case of.
Q. Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 16*, 526, 527.

Eital Praesad, Case of.
Q. Mr. Herbert; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 17*, 679.

Gurkha Police, Payment of.
Q. Sir S. King; *A.* Mr. Morley *July 24*, 1569.

Johar Mandel, Case of.
Qs. Mr. O'Grady, Sir H. Cotton, Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Morley, *July 16*, 530.

Parasnath Hill, Sacredness of.
Qs. Sir H. Cotton; *As.* Mr. Morley, *July 16*, 527, 528.

Calcutta — Queen Victoria Memorial, Form of.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 15*, 318, 319.

Civil Service—Regulations for Admission Presented, *July 16*, 466, 513.

Coconada, State of.
Q. Mr. O'Grady; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 23*, 1346.

Condition of—Effect of Alarmist Telegrams in British Press.
Qs. Mr. O'Grady; *As.* Mr. Morley, *July 23*, 1345.

Factories, Textile—Report of Committee Presented, *July 11*, 2, 35.

Habil Sircar, Case of.
Q. Mr. O'Grady; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 23*, 1346, 1347.

Orissa Records, Revision of.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 15*, 309.

Plague

Deaths from.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 16*, 531.
Q. Mr. O'Grady; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 23*, 1344, 1345.

[*cont.*

India – *cont.*

Plague—*cont.*

Inoculation, Practice of.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 22*, 1133.

Medical Staff to deal with.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 11*, 42.

Punjab

Ajit Singh and Lajpat Rai, Cases of.
Qs. Mr. Mackarness, Mr. O'Grady; *As.* Mr. Morley, *July 16*, 528, 529.

Condition of.
Q. Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 16*, 526.

"Rack Taxing in Rural India," Publication of.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 16*, 531.

Railways

Bombay-Sind Route, Memorial as to
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 18*, 902, 903.

Expenditure Sanctioned.
Q. Sir E. Sassoon; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 11*, 42.

Report (1906), Presented, *July 22*, 1081, 1129.

Rupee, Profit on Coining.
Qs. Mr. R. Duncan; *As.* Mr. Morley, *July 16*, 525, 526.
Q. Sir E. Sassoon; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 22*, 1133.
Q. Mr. Hay; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 24*, 1577.

India Office

Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. J. Morley.

Under-Secretary—Mr. C. E. H. Hobhouse.

Infant Mortality

Prevention of.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 18*, 899.

Injured Animals Act (1894) Amendment Bill

l. 2R., *July 18*, 810.
Com. and *Rep.** *July 22*, 1123.
3R.* *July 23*, 1309.

Insurance

Illegal Issue of Policies.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 22*, 1172.

Ireland

Chief Secretary—Rt. Hon. A. Birrell.

Lord-Lieutenant—Earl of Aberdeen.

Attorney-General—Rt. Hon. R. R. Cherry.

Solicitor-General—Mr. R. Barry.

[*For* particular Places, Estates, etc., *see their names.*]

Ireland—*cont.*

Agrarian Outrages (1906-7).
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 15*, 342, 343.

Agricultural and Technical Instruction Department, *see that title.*

Cattle-driving, Measures for dealing with.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. MacNeill, Mr. C. Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 17*, 702, 703.

Charitable Donations and Bequests—Meetings of Commissioners.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 17*, 667.

Congested Districts—Report Presented, *July 22*, 1081, 1128.

Constabulary, Royal Irish, *see that title.*

Education, *see that title.*

Evictions

Age of Applicants for Reinstatement.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 1135.

Claims of James Meade and Mr. Tiernan.
Qs. Mr. P. White; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 12*, 195, 196.

Information as to farms.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 15*, 343.
Qs. Viscount Castlereagh; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 1369.

Reinstatement, Progress made with, etc.—expediting Return.
Qs. Earl of Donoughmore, *July 24*, 1559, 1561; Lord Denman, 1560; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1561.

Rejected Applications

Grounds of Rejection.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 17*, 669, 670.

Method of notifying.
Q. Mr. Staveley-Hill; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 18*, 928.

Return as to Evicted Tenants Ordered, *July 24*, 1561.

Statistics and Information (1901–1906).
Q. Mr. W. Long; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 18*, 904.

Voluntary Surrenders, System of dealing with.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 15*, 343, 344.

Grazing Farms held by United Irish League Officials.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 15*, 342; *July 22*, 1137.

Labourers Acts and Cottages, *see title* Labourers (Ireland) Acts.

Land Commission, Land Judges Court, Land Purchase, *see those titles.*

Persons receiving Police Protection.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 1313, 1314.

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*
Poor Law, *see that title.*
Potato Crops, Condition of.
Q. Mr. O'Malley; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 15*, 345.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 16*, 518.
Public Works, Loans for.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 16*, 515-516.
Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 16*, 537, 538
Timber Clearances in.
Qs. Mr. Cullinan, Mr. Kilbride, Captain Donelan; *As.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 11*, 49, 50.
Trade Statistics
Date of Presenting.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 17*, 696, 697.
Report (1905), Presented, *July 22*, 1081, 1129.

Irvine Estate
Case of J. T. McQuade.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 24*, 1593.

James of Hereford, Lord
Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 11-13.

Japan
Trade Reports Presented, *July 18*, 810; *July 22*, 1080.

Jardine, Sir. J. [Roxburgh]
Finance Bill, *Con.*, *July 16*, 596.
High Court of Justice, State of Business in, Necessity for Appointment of Additional Judge, etc., *July 12*, 233.
Income-tax on Earned Incomes, Inclusion of Pensions, *July 16*, 596.
Indian Affairs, Discussion of, *July 23*, 1370.
Kelso—Casualties Collected by Superior, *July 23*, 1366.
Small Holdings—Scottish Inquiries, *July 23*, 1364.

Jersey, Earl of
Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 13.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep.*, *July 18*, 891.

Joint Stock Banks
Deposits in.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 22*, 1149, 1150.

Jones, Mr. L. [Westmoreland, Appleby.]
London County Council (General Powers) Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 128, 132, 138.

Jowett, Mr. F. W. [Bradford, W.]
Belfast Dock Strike—Case of E. O'Reilly, *July 18*, 926.

Joyce, Mr. M. [Limerick]
Butter—Railway Delays in Transmission to England, *July 17*, 709.
Milk, Irish—Facilities for sending to England, *July 15*, 341.

Judicial Statistics (Ireland)
Civil Statistics Presented, *July 11*, 2, 35.

Juvenile Offenders
Detention of in Police Stations, Objections to System
Os. Mr. H. J. Tennant, *July 18*, 964.

Kanturk
Extra Police, Employment of, for Protection of Mr. Daly
Qs. Mr. Flynn, Mr. O'Shee; *As.* Mr. Birrell, Mr. Speaker, *July 24*, 1587-1589.

Kearley, Mr. H. E.—*Parliamentary Secretary, Board of Trade* [Devonport]
Coal—Tare Weights of Wagons, *July 23*, 1362.
Companies Bill
Operation of Clause 23, *July 15*, 335.
Proposals as to, *July 15*, 308.
Cunard Line—Reason for not calling at Halifax (N.S.), *July 15*, 334.
Emigration Statistics for 1907, *July 23*, 1362.
Kirk Smeaton Bridge, Width of, *July 23*, 1363.
Light Railway Commissioners, Names of, etc., *July 23*, 1363.
Merchant Shipping—Insurance Rates on certain Routes, *July 15*, 334.
Midland Railway Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 986, 993.
Wages in Foreign Countries, *July 15*, 334.

Kelly, Mr. G. D. [Manchester, S.W.]
Naval Pension, Funds available for, *July 18*, 908.

Kelso
Superior of—Casualties collected, etc.,
Q. Sir J. Jardine; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 23*, 1366.

Kendal Corporation Bill
c. 3R.* *July 11*, 33.
l. Commons Amendts., *Con.** *July 16*, 465.

Kenmare
Rural Postman Shea, Case of.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 18*, 895, 896.

Kenmare Estate
  Cases of, Mr. D. O'Shea and Mr. C. O'Sullivan.
    Qs. Mr. Murphy ; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 24*, 1596.
  Malicious Killing of Mr. Godfrey's Cow.
    Q. Captain Craig ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 24*, 1593, 1594.

Kennedy, Mr. V. P. [Cavan, W.]
  Birth Statistics for 1906, *July 23*, 1366.
  Feeble-minded Persons, Statistics as to, *July 23*, 1367.
  Gortnakillue—Reinstatement Claim of M. Brady, *July 23*, 1333.
  Joint Stock Banks, Deposits in, *July 22*, 1149.
  Lunacy—Irish Statistics, *July 23*, 1366.
  Savings Banks, Deposits in, *July 22*, 1149.
  Swanlinbar—Petty Sessions, Case of Mrs. Prior, *July 23*, 1367.

Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill
  c. Rep. July 11*, 34.
    Con. July 19*, 1021.
    3R.* *July 23*, 1309.

Kenyon-Slaney, Col. [Shropshire, Newport]
  Death Duties—Estates for which Reliable Accounts were produced, Allowance for Maintenance, etc., *July 11*, 171–174.
  Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 739–741, 794–796 ; *July 22*, 1264–1266 ; *July 24*, 1608, 1609, 1617, 1682–1684.
  Finance Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 171–174.
  Militia, Frozen Beef supplied to, *July 12*, 198.

Kerry
  Railway Guarantees.
    Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 24*, 1565, 1566.

Keswick, Mr. W. [Surrey, Epsom]
  Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1750.

Kew Gardens
  Designation of Gardens.
    Q. Mr. Summerbell ; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 16*, 516.
  Lectures, Attendance at.
    Q. Mr. Summerbell ; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 16*, 541.

Kilbride, Mr. D. [Kildare, S.]
  Dartmoor Prison—Sentences on certain Prisoners, *July 17*, 689.
  Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 1443.
  Holywood Urban District Council—Case of J. H. Barrett, *July 11*, 50, 52.

Kilbride, Mr. D.—*cont.*
  Land Commission — Duties of Mr. Wilkinson, *July 17*, 701.
  Local Government Board Auditors, Appointment of, *July 17*, 699.
  Timber Clearances in Ireland, *July 11*, 50.

Kilkenny
  New Writ for South Kilkenny Division, *July 15*, 464.

Killanin, Lord
  Advertisements Regulation Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 29, 31 ; 3R., *July 23*, 1284.

Killery's Divorce Bill
  c. Report from Select Committee, *July 16*, 511.
    3R.* *July 19*, 1021.

Killielagh
  Speech of Member for Westmeath (North).
    Qs. Mr. C. Craig, Mr. Moore ; *As.* Mr. Birrell, Mr. Speaker, *July 17*, 706, 707.
    Qs. Mr. C. Craig ; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 24*, 1596, 1597.

Kilmeedy
  Schools—Attendance, etc.
    Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 1134.

King, Mr. [Cheshire, Knutsford]
  Hague Conference—Instructions to British Delegates, *July 24*, 1580.

King, Sir H. S. [Hull, Central]
  Finance Bill, *Con.*, *July 16*, 581, 595.
  Income-tax
    Earned Incomes, Inclusive of Pensions, *July 16*, 595.
    Incomes which have already paid Tax in the Colonies, Exemption of, proposed, *July 16*, 581.
  India—Gurkha Police in Eastern Bengal, *July 24*, 1569.

King's Norton and Northfield Urban District Council Bill
  l. 3R.* *July 15*, 261.
  c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.* July* 19, 1021.

Kingston-on-Thames
  Clarence Street Post Office—Case of Mr. Maull.
    Q. Mr. Cave ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 15*, 302, 303.

Kingswood (Whitfield Tabernacle, Schoolroom, etc.) Charity Bill
  c. 3R.* *July 16*, 648.
  l. 1R.* *July 17*, 649.

Kirk Smeaton
  Bridge, Width of.
    Qs. Mr. Clough ; *As.* Mr. Kearley, *July 23*, 1363.

"Knight Commander"
See under Russo-Japanese War.

Kynoch & Co.
Explosives manufactured by, *see under* Explosives.

Labour Conference at Berne
Recommendations of—Accession of Japan, etc.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *July 18*, 941; Mr. A. Douglas, 983.

Labourers (Ireland) Act
Article 13 of Order, Operation of.
Q. Mr. Sheeham; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 17*, 695, 696.
Cottages—Inquiry into Rejected Applications.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *July 11*, 55.

Laidlaw, Mr. R. [Renfrew, E.]
Accidents, Fatal, Reported in 1904–6, *July 17*, 666.
Small Holdings—Scottish Inquiries, *July 23*, 1365.

Lambert, Mr. G.—*Lord of the Admiralty* [Devon, S. Molton]
Admiralty Foundry Contracts—Inspection of Work, *July 16*, 523; *July 24*, 1574.
Barracks, Number of Men in, *July 24*, 1570.
"Blake" and "Blenheim," Proposals as to, *July 22*, 1157.
Channel Fleet
Destroyers available for, *July 24*, 1570.
Duties of, *July 24*, 1572, 1573.
Strength of, *July* 16, 521; *July 18*, 909, 910.
Visits to Home Ports, *July 23*, 1340.
China Station, Destroyers on, *July 23*, 1335.
Coastguard
Abolished Stations — Disposal of Buildings, *July 24*, 1571.
Reconstitution Proposals, *July 23*, 1336, 1337.
Scottish Stations, Decision as to, *July 24*, 1575.
"Cumberland," Condition of, *July 24*, 1571.
Defence of the Empire—Home Waters, Responsibility for Defence of, *July 23*, 1339, 1340.
Dockyard Discharges since 1906, *July 18*, 907.
"Dreadnought," Broadside fired by, *July 16*, 521.

Lambert, Mr. G.—*cont.*
Guns
Replacement when damaged in Action, *July 24*, 1572.
Supply of 12-pounders, *July 16*, 522.
Home Fleet, Evolutions of, *July 22*, 1157, 1158.
"King Edward VII.," Defective Rudder of
Cost of replacing, etc., *July 24*, 1573, 1574.
Inspection System, *July 23*, 1337.
Persons responsible, etc., *July 22*, 1156.
Malta Torpedo-boat Flotilla, Strength of, *July 22*, 1157.
Mediterranean Fleet, Destroyers in, *July 23*, 1335; *July 24*, 1570.
"New Zealand," Information as to, *July 24*, 1571.
Obsolete Vessels, Conditions of selling, *July 16*, 524.
Pensions, Funds available for, *July 18*, 908.
Precautions against Foreign Surprise in Home Waters, *July 22*, 1158.
"Renown," Fittings of, *July 23*, 1338.
"Ringdove," Proposals as to, *July 24*, 1575.
Rosyth Works, Expediting of, *July 16*, 524.
Rye Bay, Illegal Fishing in, *July 16*, 522.
Ships in Full Commission (1903–7), *July 23*, 1340.
Submarines, Allocation of Contracts for, *July 18*, 908, 909.
Torpedo-boat Destroyers, Life of, and Number laid down, *July 16*, 520, 521; *July 23*, 1335, 1336, 1338, 1339.
West Indies, Naval Force in, *July 23*, 1338.
White Paper, Publication of, *July 22*, 1158.

Lambert Minor's Estate
Case of J. Costelloe.
Q. Colonel Lockwood; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *July 11*, 56.

Lambton, Mr. F. W. [Durham, S.E.]
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 24*, 1622.

Lamont, Mr. N. [Buteshire]
Fishery Board Superannuation Scheme, *July 12*, 197.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill
l. Rep. July 16*, 465.

Lancaster, Duchy of
Chancellor—Rt. Hon. Sir H. Fowler.

Land Commission (Ireland)
[*See also names of Places aud Estates.*]
Clerks—Pay, Promotion and Classification.
Qs. Mr. Field ; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 1151, 1152, 1153.
Wilkinson, Mr., Duties of.
Qs. Mr. Meehan, Mr Kilbride ; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 17*, 700, 701.

Land Judges Court, Ireland
[*For* particular Estates *see their Names.*]
Estates, Proposals to Purchase by Commissioners.
Q. Mr. Ginnell ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 17*, 668, 670.

Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881
Amendment of.
Q. Mr. H. Law ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 17*, 697.

Land Purchase Ireland
[*See also names of Places, Estates, etc.*]
Correspondence between Mr. W. Moore and Commissioner Bailey.
Os. Mr. J. Redmond, *July 23*, 1451–1453 ; Mr. Moore, 1452, 1453, 1456 ; Mr. Chairman, 1452–1455 ; Mr. T. W. Russell, 1454–1458 ; Sir F. Banbury, 1455 ; Major Seely, 1455 ; Mr. Long, 1456 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1457.
Humpheys, W. Estate Duty on Property of.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale ; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 22*, 1130.
Mineral Rights.
Q. Mr. Field ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 1152, 1153.
Owners refusing to Sell.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 24*, 1564.
Philpott, Mr. J., Case of.
Q. Mr. Flynn ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 24*, 1564, 1565.

Land Tax
Commissioners appointed.
Q. Mr. Gretton ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 24*, 1584, 1585.

Land Values
Existing Contracts, Effect of Legislation on.
Q. Mr. Fell ; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 15*, 326.

Lane-Fox, Mr. G. [Yorks., W.R., Barkston Ash]
Agriculture Board, Accommodation for, *July 11*, 37.
Finance Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 163.
Income Tax—Deduction for Cost of Insurance and Expenses of Management, *July 11*, 163.

Lane-Fox, Mr. G.—*cont.*
Low Valley Roman Catholic School, *July 22*, 1176, 1177.
Navy—American Visit of Cruisers, Period of, etc., *July 24*, 1568.

Lansdowne, Marquess of
Army, Territorial Force—Total Strength available for Home Defence, *July 17*, 657, 658.
Bills
Date of Receiving—Allowing Adequate Time for Discussion, etc., *July 15*, 296.
Initiation of more Measures in House of Lords, *July 15*, 293.
Business of the House—Progress made with Measures mentioned in the King's Speech, etc., *July 15*, 290–296.
Crown Estates Converted into Small Holdings—Alleged Dispossession of Tenants, *July 16*, 508–510.
Evicted Tenants, Progress made with Reinstatement of—Return, *July 24*, 1561.
Oxford and Cambridge Universities—Inquiry into Endowment, etc., proposed, *July 24*, 1555–1559.
Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 8–10.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep.*, *July 18*, 821–823, 838–841 ; 3R., *July 23*, 1287–1290.

Larceny Bill
c. 1R.* *July 16*, 550.

Laundries
Religious Institutions, Inspection of.
Os. Mr. A. Douglas, *July 18*, 983.

Law, Mr. A. B. [Camberwell, Dulwich]
Finance Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 562.

Law, Mr. H. A. [Donegal, W.]
Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881, Amendment of, *July 17*, 697.

Law Courts
High Court of Justice, State of Business in—Necessity for Appointment of additional Judge, etc.
Os. Sir J. Walton, *July 12*, 199–205 ; Mr. Carlile, 201 ; Mr. Buckmaster, 205–213 ; Lord R. Cecil, 213–217 ; Mr. H. J. Craig, 217–221 ; Sir H. Fowler, 221 ; Mr. Bertram, 222–225 ; Mr. C. Salter, 225–230 ; Mr. Radford, 230 ; Mr. MacNeill, 231–233 ; Sir J. Jardine, 233 ; Mr. J. D. White, 234 ; Mr. Rees, 235.
Royal Courts of Justice, Accommodation in.
Q. Mr. Herbert ; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *July 18*, 902.

Law Officers of the Crown
Emoluments of.
Q. Mr. T. L. Corbett; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 22*, 1187.

Layland-Barratt, Mr. F. [Devon, Torquay]
London County Council (General Power) Bill, *Com. July 11*, 127, 139.

Lea, Mr. H. C. [St. Pancras, E.]
Admiralty Foundry Contracts—Inspection of Work, *July 24*, 1574.
Burma—Stability of Gôkteik Railway Bridge, *July 24*, 1576.
Death duty on Midleton property, *July 15*, 325.
"King Edward VII.," H.M.S., Defective Rudder of.
Cost of replacing, etc., *July 24*, 1573, 1574.
Informant, Reward of, *July 17*, 667; *July 24*, 1597.
Persons responsible, etc., *July 22*, 1156.
Letter to the "Times," Alleged Breach of Privilege by, *July 15*, 349–351—Personal Explanation, *July 16*, 548, 549.
Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Com. July 23*, 1513.
Peerages, Sale of—Procedure as to Motions for Inquiry, *July 24*, 1598, 1599.
Smith, Sir J. B., Knighthood conferred on, *July 11*, 60, 61.
Tobacco Revenue (1906–7) *July 17*, 668.

Lead Poisoning
Increase in Cases—Enforcement of Regulations and Use of Leadless Glaze.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *July 18*, 942–949; Mr. H. Samuel, 976; Mr. Gladstone, 1001, 1002.

Leahy Estate
Sale of.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 24*, 1590.

Leeds Corporation Bill
c. Lords' Amendts. *Con.,* July 15*, 299.

Leeds (South Parade Chapel) Charity Bill
c. 3R.* *July 16*, 648.
l. 1R.* *July 17*, 649.

Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill
c. 2R. *July 16*, 601.
Con., July 17*, 661.
3R.* *July 22*, 1125.
l. 1R.* *July 22*, 1078.

Levy, Sir M. [Leicestershire, Loughborough]
Midland Railway Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 991.

Lewis, Island of
Lunatics, Accommodation for.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 22*, 1142.

Lewis, Island of—*cont.*
Sanitary Condition.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 23*, 1333.
Stornoway Postal Facilities.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 22*, 1143.
Water Supply.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 22*, 1142, 1143.

Lights on Vehicles Bill
c. Con., July 11*, 191.
3R.* *July 11*, 192.
l. 1R.* *July 15*, 264.

Limited Partnerships Bill
l. Rep. July 16, 469.
3R.* *July 18*, 892.

Listowel
Land Commission sittings at.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *July 11*, 58.

Liverpool
Bonded Warehouses, Inspection of.
Q. Mr. Cleland; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 22*, 1149.

Llandwrog
School, Desks for.
Q. Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 17*, 693.

Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. D.—*The President of the Board of Trade* [Carnarvon Boroughs]
Belfast Harbour Trust, Constitution of, *July 12*, 195.
Bell Rock and Dhu Heartach Rock, Sums paid for use of, *July 16*, 515.
Bristol Pilot Dues, *July 11*, 47.
Butter, Irish—Railway Delays in transit of, *July 17*, 709.
Cellardyke—Case of Alexander Smith, *July 23*, 1326.
Colonies, British Consuls appointed in, *July 22*, 1171.
Emigration—Scottish Statistics, *July 22*, 1172, 1312.
Fiscal Policy
Colonial Preference, *July 15*, 444–447.
Food Taxation, Objections to, *July 15*, 437, 441–443.
Trade and Commerce, Growth of under a Free-Trade System, *July 15*, 438–439.
"Forest Hall" case, *July 11*, 59.
Gas Light and Coke Company — Meter rents charged, *July 22*, 1174.
Gloucester Pilotage dues, *July 16*, 510.
Insurance—Illegal issue of Policies, *July 22*, 1172.

[*cont.*

Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. D.—*cont.*
Merchant Shipping—All British Steamship line, *July 22*, 1173.
Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill, *Con July 24*, 1729-1731, 1738.
Netherfield—Saville's Crossing Accident, *July 22*, 1173.
Wages Return, Form of, *July 24*, 1583-1584.
Weights and Measures Acts—Issue of Regulations, *July 22*, 1149.

Local Government Board
President—Rt. Hon. J. Burns.
Parliamentary Secretary—Dr. Macnamara.
Building Loans, Period for Repayment of. *Q.* Mr. Whitehead; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 15*, 333.
Report—Date of Issue.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 23*, 1330-1331.

Local Government Board (Ireland)
Auditors, System of Appointing.
Qs. Mr. Meehan, Mr. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 17*, 698-699.
Promotion of Messrs. Jenkins, Monsell and Eckersley.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 1152.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill
c. 2R.* *July 16*, 511.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill
l. 2R., *July 17*, 650.
*Rep.** *July 23*, 1281.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 23*, 1282.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill.
l. 2R.* *July 23*, 1282.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 23*, 1282.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill
c. *Rep.** *July 18*, 893.
*Con.** *July 19*, 1021.
3R.* *July 22*, 1125.
l. 1R.* *July 23*, 1282.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 23*, 1282.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 23*, 1282.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 23*, 1282.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 23*, 1282.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 15) Bill
2R.* *July 23*, 1282.

Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. [Essex, Epping]
Abbeyleix, Unlawful Assembly Case, *July 11*, 57.
Crannagh Farm—Boycott of J. Haire, *July 11*, 56.
Drumkeerin district, Boycotting in, *July 11*, 54.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill—Allocation of time, *July 22*, 1215.
Lambert Minors Estate—Case of J. Costelloe, *July 11*, 56.
Question asked by one Member on behalf of another, *July 11*, 58.
Secondary Education—New Regulations issued, *July 11*, 115-117.
Volunteers—Armament of Essex Royal Garrison Artillery, *July 15*, 307.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill
c. *Con.*, *July 11*, 124.
3R.* *July 15*, 299.
l. 1R.* *July 15*, 261.

London County Council (Money) Bill
l. *Rep.** *July 16*, 465.

London and North Western Railway Bill
l. 3R.* *July 16*, 465.
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.** *July 22*, 1125.

London United Tramways Bill
l. 3R.* *July 11*, 1.

Londonderry, Marquess of
Motors, Proposals as to Fresh Legislation for, *July 16*, 489.
Qualification of Women (County and Town Councils) (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 22*, 1087.

Long, Mr. W. H. [Dublin, S.]
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 713, 746-748, 799-803; *July 22*, 1234, 1252, 1271, 1278, 1299; *July 23*, 1400-1402, 1413, 1423, 1427, 1445-1447; *July 24*, 1636-1638, 1664-1666.
Allocation of Time, *July 22*, 1208-1211.
Evictions—Statistics and Information, (1901-1906), *July 18*, 904.
Land Purchase—Correspondence between Mr. W. Moore and Commissioner Bailey, *July 23*, 1456.
Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 1485-1487.

Longton (Caroline Street Chapel) Charity Bill
- *c.* 3R.* *July 18*, 1018.
- *l.* 1R.* *July 22*, 1077.

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B. [Armagh, Mid.]
- Agrarian Outrages (1906–7), *July 15*, 342.
- Agriculture Department, Report on working of, *July 17*, 702.
- Belfast Dock Strike—Case of E. O'Reilly, *July 18*, 926, 927.
- Cattle-driving in Ireland, *July 17*, 702.
- Evictions
  - Farms, Information as to, *July 15*, 343.
  - Voluntary Surrenders, System of dealing with, *July 15*, 343.
- Grazing Farms held by United Irish League Officials, *July 15*, 342; *July 22*, 1137.
- Land Purchase
  - Humphreys, W., Duty on Property of, *July 22*, 1130.
  - Owners refusing to sell, *July 24*, 1564.
- Merchant Shipping—All British Line, *July 22*, 1155.
- Mountshannon—Case of J. Macnamara, *July 24*, 1594.
- Newfoundland Fishery Negotiations, Progress of, *July 18*, 915.
- Persons Receiving Police Protection in Ireland, *July 23*, 1313.
- Ruan Disturbance of 14th inst., *July 18*, 928.
- Tandragee—Case of S. Rainey, *July 17*, 701, 702.

Lord Advocate for Scotland
- *Rt. Hon. T. Shaw.*

Lord Chamberlain
- *Viscount Althorp.*

Lord Chancellor
- *Lord Loreburn.*

Lord Chief Justice
- *Lord Alverstone.*

Lord Great Chamberlain
- *Marquess of Cholmondeley.*

Lord Lieutenant of Ireland
- *Earl of Aberdeen.*

Lord President of the Council
- *Earl of Crewe.*

Lord Privy Seal
- *Marquess of Ripon.*

Loreburn, Lord—*Lord Chancellor*
- Army, Territorial Force, Property, Trusts, etc.—Decision as to handing over to County Associations, *July 16*, 495, 496.
- Business of the House—Progress made with Measures mentioned in the King's Speech, *July 15*, 296–298.
- Divorce Bills, Return as to, *July 16*, 491.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep.*, *July 18*, 850–852.

Lough, Mr. T.—*Parliamentary Secretary, Board of Education* [Islington, W.]
- Code, &c., Date of Circulating, *July 18*, 925.
- Medical Staff of Education Board, *July 15*, 308.
- School Building Grant, Allocation of, *July 24*, 1584.

Lovat, Lord
- Army—Territorial Force.
  - Ballot Act, Powers of Enforcing, *July 17*, 653.
  - Establishment, Proposals as to, *July 17*, 653.
  - Total Strength available for Home Defence, *July 17*, 653–656, 658.
- Sheep, Valuation of—Effect of Section I. of Agricultural Holdings Act, 1906, *July 22*, 1094.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep.** *July 18*, 834, 849; 3R.* *July 23*, 1302, 1304.

Low Valley
- Schools—Action of Education Authorities in connection with.
  - *Os.* Mr. Boland, *July 11*, 95, 96; Mr. McKenna, 103.
  - *Qs* Mr. Boland, Mr. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 17*, 692, 693.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Lane-Fox, Mr. Boland; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 22*, 1176, 1177.

Lowe, Sir F. W. [Birmingham, Edgbaston]
- Finance Bill, *Con.** *July 16*, 562–563, 567.
- Sugar Duty—Reduction on British and Colonial Sugar, proposed, *July 16*, 562.

Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. W. [Cumberland, Penrith]
- Rulings, *see under titles* Questions and Speaker.

Lucas, Lord
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep.** *July 18*, 832, 836.

Lunacy
Coles, R. Case of.
Qs. Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 22*, 1170.
Irish Statistics.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 1366, 1367.

Lundon, Mr. W. [Limerick, E.]
Dunraven Estate—Case of Mr. Spearing, *July 16*, 545.

Lupton, Mr. A. [Lincolnshire, Sleaford]
Army Ammunition—Provision of Smokeless Blank Cartridges, *July 18*, 910, *July 24*, 1575.
Chester—Case of T. Bowden, *July 17*, 691.
Croydon Vaccination Case, *July 18*, 924.
Letter to the "Times" by Member for East St. Pancras—Breach of Privilege, *July 15*, 351.
Navy—Precautions against Foreign Surprise in Home Waters, *July 22*, 1158, 1280.

Luttrell, Mr. H. F. [Devon, Tavistock]
Prisons—Flogging in, *July 23*, 1360.

Lynch, Mr. H. F. B. [Yorks., W.R., Ripon]
Foreign Office Vote, Discussion of, *July 16*, 546.
Macedonian Budget Deficit—Security for Loan, *July 15*, 322, 323.
Persia—Anglo-Russian negotiations, *July 11*, 45; *July 16*, 534.
Questions, Supplementary, Reading of, *July 16*, 529.
Turkey
Customs Increase
Assent of the Powers, *July 15*, 321.
Revenue from, *July 23*, 1354.
Ottoman Public Debt, Council of, *July 15*, 323, 324.
Railways—Grants-in-aid, *July 15*, 324.

Lynch Case.
Pardon, Reason for granting.
Qs. Lord R. Cecil, Viscount Turnour; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 15*, 328.

Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. A. [St. George's, Hanover Square]
Colonial Preference—Attitude of H.M. Government, *July 15*, 363–376, 388, 390.

McCrae, Mr. G. [Edinburgh, E.]
Finance Bill, *Con.*, *July 16*, 554.
Fordyce Academy—Dismissal of Rector, *July 15*, 338.
Income Tax—Notices of Assessment in England and Scotland, *July 16*, 554.

Macdonald, Mr. J. R. [Leicester]
Belfast Dock Strike—Interference of the Military Authorities, *July 18*, 1018.
Business of the House, Course of, *July 11*, 64.
Factories and Workshops
Home Work Committee—Constitution and Terms of Reference, *July 18*, 953, 954.
Inspectors
Assistant, Duties and *status* of, etc., *July 18*, 954–956.
Class of Men appointed and Tests imposed, *July 18*, 958, 980.
Visits made and Number of Miles travelled, *July 18*, 957.
Medical Officers, Inspections by, *July 18*, 919–921.
Hague Conference Attitude towards Protection of Private Property at Sea, *July 11*, 46.
Home Office Vote, Date fixed for Discussion of, *July 18*, 952.
Medical Officers of Health—Removal from Control of Local Authorities, proposed, *July 18*, 953.
Mines—Letter sent by Mr. J. M. Ronaldson, *July 15*, 328.
St. Helena—Condition of Zulu Prisoners, *July 18*, 897, 911, 912.
School Hygiene Congress Arrangements, *July 15*, 335.

McHugh, Mr. P. A. [Sligo, N.]
Butter and Margarine Bill—Effect on Irish Butter Trade, *July 15*, 339.
Piers and Harbours on West and North-West Coast, *July 22*, 1184.
Sligo
Fish-curing Stations, Decision as to, *July 22*, 1136.
Piers, Slips, etc., Expenditure on, *July 22*, 1136.
Tottenham Estate
Case of J. Fox, *July 22*, 1135.
Sale Proposals for, *July 15*, 341.

Mackarness, Mr. F. C. [Berks, Newbury]
Cape Colony Assembly, Resolution as to Government of Transvaal, etc., *July 22*, 1164.
India—Cases of Ajit Singh and Lajpat Rai, *July 16*, 528.
Transvaal Mine Strike—Present Situation, *July 22*, 1166, 1167.

McKenna, Mr. R.—*President, Board of Education* [Monmouth, N.]
Attendance Statistics, *July 11*, 48.
Durham Schoolmasters holding other Offices, *July 17*, 678.

[*cont.*

McKenna, Mr. R.—*cont.*
George Children, Cases of, *July 23*, 1328.
Grants—Conditions of giving to Schools, *July 22*, 1178.
Llandwrog School, Desks for, *July 17*, 693.
Low Valley Roman Catholic School, *July 11*, 103; *July 17*, 692, 693; *July 22*, 1176, 1177.
Merionethshire School Teachers' Salaries, *July 17*, 693.
Mortomley School—Salaries of Teachers, Reason for withholding, *July 11*, 103.
Policy of Education Board, Reason for omitting Statement as to, *July 11*, 71, 111.
School Hygiene Congress Arrangements, *July 15*, 335.
Schools
  Elementary
    Grant for, in Single-school Areas, *July 11*, 104, 105.
    Policy as to, *July 11*, 107, 154.
  Erection Grants, Applications for, *July 22*, 1180.
  Repair—Powers of Local Authorities to withhold Grants, *July 11*, 108–110.
  Transfer Statistics, *July 23*, 1328.
  Secondary—Number recognised, *July 23*, 1323.
Temperance, Teaching of, *July 11*, 36.
Training Colleges
  Grants to, *July 23*, 1320.
  Hostels, Government Policy as to, *July 11*, 100–102.
  Schemes for Provisions of, *July 22*, 1130.
  Welsh Code, etc., Issue of, *July 22*, 1179, 1180.

Maclean, Mr. D. [Bath]
Morocco—Capture of Kaid Sir H. Maclean, *July 22*, 1168.

MacNeill, Mr. J. G. S. [Donegal, S.]
Army Officers, Parliamentary Candidature of, *July 18*, 910, 911.
Belfast Dock Strike Sentences, *July 18*, 927.
Cattle Driving in Ireland, *July 17*, 703.
Crannagh Farm—Boycott of J. Haire, *July 11*, 56.
Dartmoor Prison—Sentences on certain Prisoners, *July 17*, 688, 690.
Egypt
  Government Officials, Salaries of, *July 23*, 1355.
  Khedivial School of Law—Evening Classes, *July 16*, 535, 536.

MacNeill, Mr. J. G. S.—*cont.*
Egypt—*cont.*
  Regent, Identity of, *July 23*, 1357, 1358.
  State Railways and Telegraphs Expenditure, *July 23*, 1355.
Law Courts—High Court of Justice, State of Business in, *July 12*, 231–233.
Letter to *The Times* by Member for East St. Pancras—Breach of Privilege, *July 15*, 346, 357, 358.
Low Valley Roman Catholic School, *July 17*, 693.
Peerages, Brokerage and Sale of, *July 16*, 548; *July 18*, 930.
Post Office Savings Bank
  Deficiency, Suggestion for Meeting, *July 18*, 918.
  Rates of Interest, *July 18*, 917.
Public Trustee, Appointment of, *July 16*, 543.
Question asked by one Member on behalf of Another, *July 11*, 57.
Soudan—Nile Bridge at Khartoum, *July 23*, 1355.
Torpedo-boat Destroyers, Number of, *July 23*, 1335.

MacVeagh, Mr. J. [Down, S.]
Ardglass Harbour—Danger from Churn Rock, *July 22*, 1147.
Banbridge Petty Sessions, Cases heard at, *July 22*, 1184.
Bellaghy Postal Mail Cart contractor, *July 22*, 1143.
Insurance—Illegal issue of Policies, *July 22*, 1172.
War Office Clothing Contracts placed with Irish Firms, *July 23*, 1321.

Macedonia
Budget Deficit—Security for Loan.
  Q. Mr. Lynch; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July* *A.* Sir *15*, 322, 323.
Outrages—Punishment inflicted on Perpetrators.
  Q. Dr. Rutherford; Mr. Rees; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 11*, 44.

Magan Estate
Sale of—Reinstatement claim of P. Grady.
  Q. Mr. John O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 11*, 37.

Magistrates
Fees payable in England and Wales on Appointment—Return ordered, *July 11*, 35.

Maher Estate
Case of Mrs. Walsh.
  Q. Mr. Meagher; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *July 11*, 54.

Mail Service
See under Post Office.

Mall to Charing Cross
Electric Light Standards, Erection of.
Q. Mr. Starkey ; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *July 22*, 1180, 1181.

Malmesbury, Earl of
Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 10.

Malta
Torpedo-boat Flotilla, Strength of.
Q. Mr. Fell ; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 15*, 314.
Q. Mr. Fell, Mr. A. Chamberlain ; *As.* Mr. Lambert, *July 22*, 1157.

Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill
c. Rep. July 18*, 893.

Markham, Mr. A. B. [Notts., Mansfield]
Home Office Vote, Discussion of, *July 18*, 1020 ; *July 22*, 1188, 1189.
Letter to *The Times* by Member for East St. Pancras—Breach of Privilege, *July 15*, 356–358 ; *July 16*, 550.
Peerages—Impeachment of Earl of Oxford in 1715, *July 18*, 929, 930.

Marks, Mr. H. H. [Kent, Thanet]
Finance Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 183, 188, 189.
Guernsey Company Law, *July 24*, 1580.
Income Tax—Exemption of Workmen's Compensation Act Payments, proposed, *July 11*, 183–185.
Stamp Duty on Insurance Policies, *July* 11, 188, 189.

Marnham, Mr. F. J. [Surrey, Chertsey]
Motor Track at Brooklands, Traffic in vicinity of, *July 23*, 1360, 1361.

Married Women's Property Bill
c. 3R.* *July 16*, 648.
l. 1R.* *July 17*, 649.

Marylebone
Council School Managers, Appointment of.
Q. Mr. Whitehead ; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 24*, 1567.

Mason, Mr J. F. [Windsor]
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com. July 17*, 769, 792 ; *July 22*, 1250, 1260 ; *July 23*, 1426.
Telegraph and Telephone Accounts, Keeping of, *July 23*, 1363.
Windsor Victoria Barracks, Erection of, *July 23*, 1344.

Masterman, Mr. C. F. G. [West Ham, N.]
Education
 Meals for Children, Provision of, *July 11*, 118.
 Moral Instruction, Absence of Provision for, *July 11*, 121, 122
 Necessitous areas, Grants in, *July 11*, 119–121.
 Secondary Education—New Regulations issued, *July 11*, 117.

May Island
Illegal Trawling near.
Q Major Anstruther-Gray ; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 15*, 338, 339.

Mayo, Earl of
Poor Law Reform in Ireland, Necessity for, *July 22*, 1113–1116.

Meagher, Mr. M. [Kilkenny, N.]
Education Grant (1906–7) Amount of, *July 16*, 545.
Maher Estate—Case of Mrs. Walsh, *July 11*, 54.
Mountgarret Estate — Case of Mrs. Kennedy, *July 11*, 55.
Omara Estate—Case of P. Grace, *July 15*, 344.

Meath, Earl of
Poor Law Reform in Ireland, Necessity for, *July 22*, 1120.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep.*, *July 18*, 815–820.

Medical Officers of Health
Control of—Removal from Local Authorities, proposed.
Os. Mr. J. R. Macdonald, *July 18*, 953.

Meehan, Mr. P. A. [Queen's County, Leix]
Barrow River Drainage, *July 17*, 697, 698.
Land Commission Duties of Mr. Wilkinson, *July 17*, 700, 701.
Local Government Board Auditors—Appointment of, *July 17*, 698, 699.
Prisons, Irish—Warders' Salaries, *July 17*, 699.

Members of Parliament
Communications to the Press,—*see under* Parliamentary Procedure.

Menzies, Mr. W. [Lanarkshire, S.]
Ecclesiastical Assessment in Scotland, *July 15*, 337.
Feu Duties and Long Building Leases in Scotland, *July 24*, 1586.
Scottish Rateable Property, *July 24*, 1568.

Merchant Shipping
[*For* particular Vessels, *see their names.*]
All British Steamship Line.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale ; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 22*, 1155.
Qs. Mr. Fell, Mr. C. Hay ; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, July *22*, 1173.
Insurance Rate on Certain Routes.
Q. Mr. H. Cox ; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *July 15*, 334.

Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment Bill
l. Rep. July 23*, 1283.

Merchant Shipping (Tonnage Deduction for Propelling Power) Bill
c. *Rep.* July 17*, 710.

Merionethshire
School Teachers' Salaries, Payment of.
Q. Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 17*, 693.

Merthyr Tydfil Stipendiary Justice Bill
c. *Rep.* July 22*, 1126.

Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill
c. *Con., July 23*, 1475.

Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill
c. *Con., July 24*, 1723.

Meysey-Thompson, Mr. E. C. [Staffordshire, Handsworth]
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com., July 23*, 1385, 1395, 1412.

Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill
c. *Rep.* July 18*, 893.
Con. July 23*, 1309.

Midland Railway Bill
c. 2R. *July 18*, 985.

Midleton, Viscount
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep., July 18*, 824, 865–870, 890; 3R., *July 23*, 1303.

Mildmay, Mr. F. R. [Devon, Totnes]
Coastguard Stations—Disposal of Buildings, *July 24*, 1571.

Militia
Frozen Beef supplied to Battalions out for Training.
Q. Colonel Kenyon-Slaney; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 198.
Officers selected for discussing Matters with War Office.
Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 11*, 41.
Regulations Presented, *July 15*, 263, 301.
Special Contingent, Inducements to join.
Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 11*, 41.
Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 16*, 525.
Special Reserve
Enlistment, Terms of.
Os. Duke of Bedford, Earl of Portsmouth, *July 15*, 268.
Rate of Pay and Qualifications.
Os. Duke of Bedford, *July 15*, 267; Earl of Portsmouth, 268.

Milk
Irish—Facilities for sending to England.
Qs. Mr. Halpin, Mr. Joyce; *As.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 15*, 340, 341.

Mines
Accidents, Increase in Number of.
Os. Mr. A. Douglas, *July 18*, 981.
Eight Hours Day—Legislative Proposals.
Os. Mr. Gladstone, *July 18*, 933, 1,000; Mr. Brace, 959; Mr. A. Douglas, 981.
Inspectorate, Proposed Changes in.
Os. Mr. Gladstone, *July 18*, 933.
Inspectors, System of Appointing.
Os. Mr. Summerbell, *July 18*, 969.
Medal for Life-saving, Establishment of.
Os. Mr. Gladstone, *July 18*, 933.
Reports by Owners, Incomplete Nature of.
Os. Mr. Brace, *July 18*, 959, 960.
Rescue Appliances, Provision of.
Os. Mr. Brace, *July 18*, 960-963; Mr. A. Douglas, 981; Mr. Gladstone, 1003.
Scottish—Letter sent by Mr. J. M. Ronaldson.
Qs. Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 15*, 328.

Mitchell-Thomson, Mr. W. [Lanark, N.W.]
Coastguard — Decision as to Scottish Stations, *July 24*, 1575.
Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *July 16*, 619–622.
Navy
Colonial Stations, Vessels for, *July 17*, 680.
"Indefatigable" and "Scylla," Destination of Marines in, *July 11*, 38, 39; *July 17*, 681.
"Ringdove," Proposals as to, *July 24*, 1574, 1575, 1585.
New Hebrides—Punitive Expedition of H.M.S. "Cambrian," *July 17*, 687.
Pacific Islanders Protection Act, Amendment Proposals, *July 22*, 1188.
St. Helena—Labour for Transvaal, Conditions of supplying, *July 22*, 1168.
Scottish Standard, Rules as to displaying, *July 16*, 543, 544.
Sewage Disposal Final Report, Date of Presenting, *July 22*, 1175.
Transvaal Mines—Conditions of importing Labour, *July 17*, 686.

Mitchelstown
Postal Facilities.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Captain Norton, *July 22*, 1186, 1187.

Monastic and Conventual Institutions.
Laundries—*see that title.*

Mond, Mr. A. [Chester].
Chester—Case of T. Bowden, *July 17*, 690.
Transvaal—Troops employed in Johannesburg, *July 17*, 686.

Money, Mr. L. G. Chiozza [Paddington, N.]
  Factories
    Inspectors' Reports, *July 15*, 331.
    Label-licking in, *July 15*, 332.
  Wages Return, Form of, *July 24*, 1583, 1584.

Monk Bretton, Lord
  Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 3–5.

Montagu of Beaulieu, Lord
  Army, Territorial Force—Decision as to handing over Property, Trusts, &c., to County Associations, *July 16*, 494, 495.
  Motors, Proposals as to Fresh Legislation for, *July 16*, 486–488.
  Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep.*, *July 18*, 831, 853.

Monteagle of Brandon, Lord
  Poor Law Reform in Ireland, Necessity for, *July 22*, 1105–1111, 1123.

Montgomery, Mr. H. G. [Somerset, Bridgwater]
  Workhouse Chaplains, Provision of, *July 22*, 1147.

Mooney, Mr. J. J. [Newry]
  Evicted Tenants Bill — Amendment omitted from Record in "Votes and Proceedings," *July 23*, 1371.
  National School Teachers' Salaries, *July 23*, 1368, 1369.

Moore, Mr. W. [Armagh, N.]
  Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 712, 723, 736–739, 788–790; *July 23*, 1377, 1385–1388, 1397, 1411, 1416, 1419, 1421, 1428, 1447–1451; *July 24*, 1601, 1602, 1604, 1609, 1616, 1617, 1625, 1629, 1666–1669, 1677–1679, 1681.
    Amendment omitted from Record in "Votes and Proceedings," *July 23*, 1372.
  Killielagh—Speech of Member for Westmeath (North), *July 17*, 707.
  Land Purchase—Correspondence with Mr. Commissioner Bailey, *July 23*, 1452, 1453, 1456.
  Waste Lands (Ireland) Improvement Bill, Intro., *July 17*, 711.

Morley, Rt. Hon. J.—*Secretary of State for India* [Montrose Burghs]
  Arracan Capitation Tax, *July 16*, 531, 532.
  Bengal
    Ebrahim Munshi, Case of, *July 16*, 527.
    Eital Praesad, Case of, *July 17*, 679.

Morley, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
  Bengal—*cont.*
    Gurkha Police, Payment of, *July 24*, 1569.
    Johar Mandel, Case of, *July 16*, 530.
    Sacredness of Parasnath Hill, *July 16*, 527, 528.
  Coconada, State of, *July 23*, 1346.
  Condition of India—Effect of alarmist telegrams in British Press, *July 23*, 1345.
  Habil Sircar, Case of, *July 23*, 1347.
  Orissa Records, Revision of, *July 15*, 309.
  Plague
    Deaths from, *July 16*, 531; *July 23*, 1345.
    Inoculation, Practice of, *July 22*, 1133.
    Medical Staff to deal with, *July 11*, 42.
  Punjab
    Cases of Ajit Singh and Lajpat Rai, *July 16*, 528, 529.
    Condition of, *July 16*, 526.
  "Rack-Taxing in Rural India," Publication of, *July 16*, 531.
  Railways
    Expenditure sanctioned, *July 11*, 42.
    Memorial as to Bombay-Sind Route, *July 18*, 903.
  Rupees
    Amount used in East Africa, *July 23*, 1324, 1325.
    Profit on Coining, *July 16*, 526; *July 22*, 1133.

Morocco
  Kaid Sir H. Maclean, Capture of.
    Q. Mr. Maclean; *A.* Mr. J. A. Pease, *July 22*, 1168.
    Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 23*, 1359.

Mortomley
  School—Salaries of Teachers withheld owing to Refusal of Authorities to asphalte Playground.
    Qs. Mr. Boland, *July 11*, 94; Mr. McKenna, 103.

Morton, Mr. A. C. [Sutherland]
  Finance Bill, *Con.*, *July 16*, 594, 645.
  Hungerford Justices' Clerk, Fines and Fees collected by, *July 24*, 1582.
  Income Tax
    Business discontinued—Three Years' Average Assessment, *July 16*, 645.
    Earned Incomes—Inclusion of Pensions, *July 16*, 594.
  Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.,) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 1514–1516.
  Midland Railway Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 985, 987, 992.
  "Ringdove," Proposals as to, *July 24*, 1585, 1586.

Motors
Accidents during 1905 and 1906.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 23*, 1329, 1330.
Brooklands Track—Regulation of Traffic in Vicinity.
Qs. Mr. Marnham, Mr. Trevelyan; *As.* Mr. Burns, *July 23*, 1360, 1361.
Legislation for, Proposals as to.
Os. Earl Russell, *July 16*, 483-486; Lord Montagu of Beaulieu, 486-488; Lord Allendale, 488; Marquess of Londonderry, 489.

Mount-Edgcumbe, Earl of
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep.*, *July 18*, 836; *July 23*, 1292-1295, 1305, 1307.

Mountgarret Estate
Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. Kennedy.
Q. Mr. Meagher; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *July 11*, 55.

Mountmellick
Labourer's Cottage—Applications of M. Delaney and T. Gaffney.
Qs. Mr. Sheehan; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 16*, 514, 515; *July 17*, 694.

Mountshannon
Case of J. Macnamara.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 24*, 1594.

Municipal Representation Bill
l. Rep.,* *July 23*, 1283.

Murphy, Mr. J. [Kerry, E.]
Kenmare Estate—Cases of D. O'Shea and C. O'Sullivan, *July 24*, 1596.

Muskerry, Lord
Pyrotechnic Morse Code, Use of, in the Navy, *July 15*, 264.

Nannetti, Mr. J. P. [Dublin, College Green]
Dublin
Metropolitan Police—Instructions as to Drunken Persons entering Licensed Houses, *July 23*, 1333.
Telegraph Messengers, Duties and Pay of, *July 17*, 675.

Naphtha
Dangers of—Protection of Workers.
Os. Mr. H. J. Tennant, *July 18*, 968, 969, 978; Mr. H. Samuel, 977, 978.

Natal
Leask, J., Assault on Coolie by.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 24*, 1578, 1579.
Veal, Mr., Sentences inflicted on Natives for Murder of.
Q. Mr. Byles; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 15*, 319.
Zulu Prisoners deported to St. Helena, *see under* St. Helena.

Navigation Works (Ireland) Bill
Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Barrie; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 18*, 929.

Navy
First Lord—Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedmouth.
Financial Secretary—Rt. Hon. E. Robertson.
American Visit of Cruisers, Period of and Number of Desertions during.
Q. Mr. Lane-Fox; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 24*, 1568.
Barracks, Number of Men in.
Q. Mr. Beauchamp; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 24*, 1570.
Battleships (*see also Subheadings Names of Ships*).
British and Foreign—Return presented, *July 15*, 263.
Nucleus Crews, Complements of.
Qs. Mr. Hunt, Mr. L. Harris; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 15*, 313.
"Blake" and "Blenheim"
Armament of.
Qs. Mr. Gretton; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 11*, 40, 41.
Proposals as to.
Qs. Captain Faber; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 22*, 1156, 1157.
Boys, Sea-training of.
Q. Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 15*, 303.
Channel Fleet
Destroyers available for.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 24*, 1570.
Duties of.
Qs. Mr. Bellairs, Mr. H. J. Craig; *As.* Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lambert, *July 24*, 1572, 1573.
Scouts and Torpedo Craft attached to.
Q. Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 15*, 305.
Qs. Mr. Hunt; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 15*, 312.
Strength of.
Qs. Mr. Nield; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 15*, 304, 305.
Q. Mr. George Faber; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 15*, 311.
Qs. Sir B. Sheffield, Mr. Bellairs, Mr. Pirie; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 16*, 521.
Qs. Mr. George Faber; *As.* Mr. Lambert, *July 18*, 909, 910.
Visits to Home Ports, Intimation of.
Q. Mr. C. E. Price; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 23*, 1340.
China Station, Destroyers on.
Qs. Mr. Hunt, Mr. Bellairs; *As.* Mr. Lambert, *July 23*, 1335.

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*

Colonial Stations, Vessels for.
Q. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 17*, 680.

Cordite

Mercuric Chloride, Addition of, *see under* Explosives.

Courts-martial—Return (1906) Presented, *July 17*, 650, 661.

Cruisers

British and Foreign—Return Presented, *July 15*, 263.

Nucleus Crews, Complements of.
Qs. Mr. Hunt, Mr. L. Harris; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 15*, 313.

"Cumberland"

Condition of.
Q. Mr. Hunt; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 24*, 1571.

Docking of.
Qs. Mr. Hunt; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 11*, 37, 38.

Dock Accommodation for Large Battleships.
Q. Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 16*, 514.

Dockyards (*see also subheadings names of Dockyards*)

Discharges since 1906.
Qs. Mr. Staveley-Hill; *As.* Mr. Lambert, *July 18*, 907.

"Dreadnought," Broadside fired by.
Q. Sir B. Sheffield; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 16*, 521.

Electricians, Badge for.
Q. Mr. Alden; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 17*, 666.

Guns

Replacement of Guns damaged in Action.
Q. Mr. Gretton; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 24*, 1571, 1572.

Twelve-pounder, Reason for reducing.
Qs. Mr. Courthope; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 11*, 39, 40.
Qs. Mr. Courthope; *As.* Mr. Lambert, *July 16*, 521, 522.

Home Fleet, Evolutions of.
Qs. Mr. Fell, Mr. Bellairs; *As.* Mr. Lambert, *July* 22, 1157, 1158.

"Indefatigable" and "Scylla," Destination of and Marines in.
Qs. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 11*, 38, 39.

"King Edward VII.," Defective Rudder supplied to.
Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 11*, 38.

Cost of Replacing.
Qs. Mr. Lea, Mr. A. Dewar; *As.* Mr. Lambert, *July 24*, 1573, 1574.

Navy—*cont.*

"King Edward VII."—*cont.*

Inspection, System of.
Qs. Mr. Courthope, Mr. A. Henderson; *As.* Mr. Lambert, *July 23*, 1337.

Persons Responsible, etc.,
Qs. Mr. Lea; *As.* Mr. Lambert, *July 22*, 1156.

Report proposed.
Q. Mr. Lea; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 24*, 1573.

Reward Conferred on Informant.
Q. Mr. Lea; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 17*, 667.
Q. Mr. Lea; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 24*, 1597, 1598.

Lamp Trimmers' Allowances—Order Presented, *July 22*, 1082, 1128.

Manœuvres during last Five Years.
Q. Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 15*, 306.

Mediterranean Station, Destroyers on.
Qs. Mr. Hunt, Mr. Bellairs; *As.* Mr. Lambert, *July 23*, 1335.
Q. Mr. A. Chamberlain; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 24*, 1570.

Mobilisation under New Scheme.
Qs. Mr. Hunt; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 15*, 311, 312, 314.

"New Zealand," Information as to.
Q. Mr. Hunt; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 24*, 1571.

Obsolete Vessels, Conditions of selling.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 16*, 523, 524.

Officers

Chinese, Allowances for studying—Order Presented, *July 22*, 1082, 1128.

Servants' Condition of Service—Order Presented, *July 22*, 1082, 1128.

Osborne College, *see that title.*

Pay—List of Exceptions Presented, *July 17*, 650, 661.

Pensions

Funds available for, etc.
Q. Mr. Kelly; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 18*, 908.

Rule as to Commutation.
Q. Mr. James O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 18*, 898, 899.

Prize Money (1906–7)—Account Presented, *July 18*, 895.

Protection of the Fleet against surprise attack in Home Waters, Provision for.
O. Mr. Lupton, *July 22*, 1280.
Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 22*, 1158.

Pyrotechnic Morse Code, Decision as to.
Os Lord Muskerry, Earl of Granard, *July 15*, 264.

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*
"Renown," Armament of.
Qs. Mr. Gretton, Lord Balcarres; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 11*, 40.
Q. Mr. Gretton; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 23*, 1338.
"Ringdove," Proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *As.* Mr. Lambert, *July 24*, 1574, 1575.
Qs. Mr. Moreton, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 24*, 1585, 1586.
Rosyth Works, Expediting of.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 16*, 524.
"Scylla," Condition of.
Qs Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson *July 17*, 681.
Shipbuilding Programme, Modification in.
Q. Mr. Hunt; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 11*, 38.
Ships in Full Commission (1903–7).
Q. Mr. Hunt; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 23*, 1340.
Submarines, Contracts for.
Qs. Mr. George Faber; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, Mr. Speaker, *July 15*, 310, 311.
Qs. Mr. George Faber; *As.* Mr. Lambert, *July 18*, 908, 909.
Surveying Ships Officers Pay—Order in Council, presented *July 22*, 1082, 1128.
Torpedo-Boat Crews, Medical Examination of.
Q. Mr. Alden; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 22*, 1130.
Torpedo-Boat Destroyers, Life of and Number laid down.
Qs. Sir B. Sheffield, Mr. Bellairs; *As.* Mr. Lambert, *July 16*, 520, 521.
Qs. Mr. MacNeill, Mr. Ashley, Mr. A. Chamberlain; *As.* Mr. Lambert, *July 23*, 1335, 1336.
Qs. Mr. Bellairs; *As.* Mr. Lambert, *July 23*, 1338, 1339.
Training
Sail-drill and Mast and Yard Exercises
Q. Mr. Bowles; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 17*, 681.
White Paper, Publication of.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 22*, 1158.

Nelson, Earl
Ecclesiastical Commissioners—Return in continuation of Return No. 71, *July 22*, 1083.

Netherfield
Saville's Crossing, Accident at.
Q. Mr. Thorne; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 22*, 1173.

New Hebrides
Arms, &c., Importation of.
Qs. Major Anstruther-Gray, Sir G. Parker; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 18*, 913.

New Hebrides—*cont.*
Convention, Licences issued under.
Qs. Mr. Staveley-Hill, Sir G. Parker; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 16*, 532, 533.
Female and Child Labour—Inspection System.
Q. Mr. Staveley-Hill; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 11*, 44.
Importation Restrictions on British Traders.
Qs. Sir G. Parker; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 1348, 1349.
Punitive Expedition of H.M.S. "Cambrian."
Q. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 17*, 687.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 18*, 913.

Newfoundland
Fisheries—Progress of negotiations with United States.
Qs. Mr. Hart-Davies, Mr. Ashley; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 11*, 45.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, Sir G. Parker; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 18*, 915, 916.

Newry
Constabulary Force, Religion of.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 18*, 903, 904.

Newton, Lord
Army—Territorial Force, Total strength available for Home Defence, *July 17*, 656.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep.*, *July 18*, 821; 3R., *July 23*, 1302.

Newtownforbes
Police Presence at Meeting.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 16*, 517.

Nield, Mr. [Middlesex, Ealing]
Navy
Boys, Sea-Training of, *July 15*, 303.
Channel Fleet, Strength of, *July 15*, 304, 305.
Dock Accommodation for Large Battleships, *July 16*, 514.
Manœuvres during last Five Years, *July 15*, 306.

Nolan, Mr. J. [Louth, S.]
Singleton Estate, Sale of, *July 15*, 304.

North British Railway Bill
c. Rep. July 17*, 661.
Con. July 24*, 1562.

North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill
l. Rep. June 16*, 465.
3R.* *July 22*, 1077.

Northumberland, Duke of
Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) Bill, *Com., July 11*, 14-16.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep., July 18*, 831, 845.

Norton, Capt. C. W.—*Lord of the Treasury* [Newington, W.]
Ballinskelligs Postmaster, Retirement of, *July 22*, 1186.
Mail Service—Terms of P. and O. Contract, *July 22*, 1175, 1176.
Mitchelstown Postal Facilities, *July 22*, 1187.
Postal Officials—Compensation for Injuries, *July 22*, 1175.
Telegraph and Telephone Account, Keeping of, *July 23*, 1364.
Westmoreland, Telephone Service Charges, *July 22*, 1176.

Norway
Fugitive Criminals, Mutual Surrender of—Treaty Presented, *July 16*, 466, 512 ; *July 22*, 1081, 1127.

Nurses
Registration of.
Q. Mr. Hart-Davies ; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 16*, 539.

Nyasaland
Order in Council Presented, *July 22*, 1082, 1127.

O'Brien, Mr. K. E. [Tipperary, Mid.]
Telegraph Messengers, Pay and Sunday Duty of, *July 18*, 900, 901.

O'Connor, Mr. Jas [Wicklow, W.]
Pensions—Rule as to Commutation, *July 18*, 898.

O'Connor, Mr. John [Kildare, N.]
Magan Estate, Sale of, etc., *July 11*, 37.

O'Connor, Mr. T. P. [Liverpool, Scotland]
Education
Secondary Education—New Regulations in connection with, *July 11*, 146-149.
Training Colleges—Hostels in connection with, Government Policy as to, *July 11*, 147-149.

O'Donnell, Mr. T. [Kerry, W.]
Kerry Railway Guarantees, *July 24*, 1565.

O'Grady, Mr. J. [Leeds, E.]
India
Bengal—Case of Johar Mandel, *July 16*, 530.
Condition of — Effect of Alarmist Telegrams in British Press, *July 23*, 1345.

O'Grady, Mr. J.—*cont.*
India—*cont.*
Coconada, State of, *July 23*, 1346.
Habil Sircar, Case of, *July 23*, 1346.
Plague—Statistics as to Deaths, *July 23*, 1344.
Punjab — Cases of Ajit Singh and Lajpat Rai, *July 16*, 528, 529.
Questions—Right to demand Information *July 16*. 529.

O'Malley, Mr. W. [Galway, Connemara]
Clifden Pier Works—Cause of Delay, *July 15*, 344.
Potato Crop, Conditions of, *July 15*, 345.

O'Mara Estate
Reinstatement Claims of P. Grace.
Q. Mr. Meagher ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 15*, 344.

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. P. J. [Limerick, W.]
Kilmeedy Schools — Attendance, etc., *July 22*, 1134.
Synan Estate, Purchase of, *July 22*, 1155.

O'Shee, Mr. J. J. [Waterford, W.]
Constabulary, Allocation of, *July 17*, 671.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com., July 22*, 1274, 1275, 1279 ; *July 23*, 1380, 1429-1432, 1434, 1448 ; *July 24*, 1644.
Kanturk extra Police—Case of Mr. Daly, *July 24*, 1589.
Soldiers, Civil Employment of — Timekeeper on Devonshire Estates. *July 23*, 1342.

Old Age Pensions
Tables and Memorandum, Presented, *July 11*, 3, 35.

Old Kilpatrick
Dalmuir Land purchased for New School.
Q. Mr. J. D. White ; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 22*, 1182.

Onslow, Earl of
Local Government Provisional Order Bills, Suspension of Standing Order, *July 23*, 1282.
Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill, 2R., *July 17*, 650.

Orange River Colony
Farms, Valuation of.
Q. Sir G. Parker ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 1350.

Ordnance Survey
Civil Assistants, Position of.
Q. Mr. Power ; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 22*, 1148, 1149.

Orkney
Oyster Order, Report on
Q. Sir A. Bignold ; *A.* Mr Sinclair, *July 16*, 513, 514.

Osborne
Report (1906–7) Presented, *July 22*, 1081, 1129.

Ottoman Public Debt
See under Turkey.

Oxford, Bishop of
Oxford and Cambridge Universities—Inquiry into Endowment, Administration and Teaching, proposed, *July 24*, 1549–1551.

Oxford University
Endowment, Government, Administration and Teaching, Inquiry into, proposed.
Os. Bishop of Birmingham, *July 24*, 1526–1533; Bishop of Bristol, 1533–1539; Lord Ellenborough, 1539–1543; Bishop of Hereford, 1543–1547; Lord Burghclere, 1547–1548; Bishop of Oxford, 1549–1551; Earl of Crewe, 1551–1555; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1555–1559.

Oxford and District Tramways Bill
c. Rep., July 11*, 34.
Con., July 22*, 1125.

Pacific Cable Act
Accounts Presented, *July 15*, 263, 302.

Pacific Islands
Civil Marriages—Order in Council Presented, *July 22*, 1082, 1127.

Pacific Islanders Act
Amendment Proposals.
Q. Mr. Staveley-Hill; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 16*, 547.
Q. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 22*, 1188.

Pacific Order in Council
Presented, *July 22*, 1082, 1127.

Panama Canal
Trinidad Labourers, Contract for work of.
Qs. Mr. Starkey, Lord Balcarres; *As.* Mr Churchill, *July 23*, 1351, 1352.

Parker, Mr. J. [Halifax]
Death Duties on Landed Estates, *July 16*, 589.
Finance Bill, *Con., July 16*, 589.

Parker, Sir G. [Gravesend]
Africa, East, Under-Secretary's visit to, *July 24*, 1579.
Army Ammunition, Defective, Withdrawal of, *July 15*, 316.
Egypt—Khedivial School of Law Rectorship, *July 16*, 535.

Parker, Sir G —*cont.*
Emigration Statistics for 1907, *July 23*, 1362.
Foreign Office Vote, Discussion of, *July 16*, 547.
Hague Conference Decisions as to International Disarmament, *July 24*, 1597.
Newfoundland Fishery Negotiations, Progress of, *July 18*, 916.
New Hebrides
  Convention, Licences issued under, *July 16*, 532.
  Importation of Arms, etc., *July 18*, 913; *July 23*, 1348, 1349.
Orange River Colony—Farms, Valuation of, *July 23*, 1350.
St. Helena
  Grant-in-aid, Proposals for, *July 23*, 1349.
  Trading Facilities with Cape Colony, *July 15*, 319.
Transvaal
  British Civil Servants, Position of, *July 23*, 1350, 1351.
  Loan of £5,000,000, Issue of, *July 23*, 1348.
  Mines—Conditions of importing British Labour, *July 24*, 1577.
West Indies—Naval Force, *July 11*, 39; *July 15*, 313; *July 23*, 1337.
Wireless Telegraphy—Discussion of Radio-telegraphic Convention Report, *July 11*, 62; *July 18*, 931.

Parliament
House of Lords, New Peers introduced to—Baron Tredegar, *July 16*, 465.

Parliamentary Debates
Reporting, New Arrangements for—Discussion of Committee Report, etc.
Q. Mr. Seaverns; *A.* Mr. Runciman. *July 22*, 1148.
Q. Mr. Byles; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 22*, 1188.

Parliamentary Elections
New Members Sworn—Mr. A. V. Grayson for Yorkshire (Colne Valley), *July 23*, 1375.
New Writs Issued
  Kilkenny, South, *July 15*, 464.
  Stafford (North West), *July 15*, 298
  Wicklow, East, *July 17*, 660.
Reform Proposals.
Q. Mr. Dunn; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 11*, 63, 64.

Parliamentary Procedure
Anticipatory Motions—Report Presented, *July 23*, 1375.
Bills, *see that title.*

[*cont*

Parliamentary Procedure—*cont.*
Communications to the Press by Members, Breach of Privilege by—Letter of Member for East St. Pancras to *The Times.*
Os. Lord R. Cecil, Mr. Speaker, *July 12*, 198 ; Lord R. Cecil, *July 15*, 346–349, 355 ; Mr. Lea, 349–351 ; Mr. Lupton, 351 ; Sir H. Campbell Bannerman, 351–354 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 354 ; Mr. Shackleton, 356 ; Mr. R. Duncan, 356 ; Mr. Markham, 356–358 ; Mr. S. MacNeill, 346, 357, 358 ; Mr. Speaker, 347, 351, 352, 357, 358.
Personal Explanation (Mr. Lea), *July 16*, 548, 549.
Members of Parliament, *see that title.*
Relations between Lords and Commons—Legislative Proposals for Next Session.
Q. Capt. Faber ; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 23*, 1369, 1370.

Pasley Children Legitimisation Bill
c. Rep. July 18*, 894.
Con. July 23*, 1310.

Pease, Mr. H. P. [Darlington]
Armour piercing Projectiles, Inventor of Cap for, *July 12*, 197.
Poor Law—Children, Statistics as to, *July 23*, 1361.
Postal Officials, Compensation for Injuries to, *July 22*, 1175.
Transvaal Loan of £5,000,000, Issue of, *July 23*, 1348.
Vagrancy Law, Proposals as to, *July 24*, 1598.

Pease, Mr. J. A.—*Lord of the Treasury* [Essex, Saffron Walden]
Asia Minor—Safeguarding of British Interests, *July 22*, 1168.
Egypt—Rectorship of Khedivial School of Law, *July 22*, 1169.
Home Office Vote—Facilities for Discussion, *July 18*, 1020.
Morocco—Capture of Kaid Sir H. Maclean, *July 22*, 1168.

Peerages
Brokerage and Sale of
Notice of Motion [Mr. S. MacNeill], *July 16*, 548.
Procedure as to Motions for Inquiry.
Qs. Mr. Lea ; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 24*, 1598, 1599.
Impeachment of Earl of Oxford in 1715, Circumstances of.
Qs. Mr. Markham ; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 18*, 929, 930.

Penrith Urban District Council Bill
l. 3R.* *July 17*, 649.
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.* July 22*, 1125.

Persia
Anglo-Russian Negotiations.
Qs. Mr. Lynch ; *As.* Sir E. Grey, Mr. Speaker, *July 11*, 45, 46.
Q. Mr. Lynch ; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 16*, 534.
Trade Report Presented, *July 16*, 466, *July 22*, 1080.

Persian Gulf
British Naval Vessels in
Q. Mr. Rees ; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 17*, 680.

Petty Sessions Clerks (Ireland) Bill
c. Report from Standing Committee A. *July 15*, 361.
Con., and 3R.* *July 16*, 648.
l. 1R.* *July 17*, 651.

Phosphorus Poisoning
Moreland's Match Factory Case, Report on.
Os. Mr. Gladstone, *July 18*, 938.
Substitutes for white and yellow Phosphorus in the Match Trade.
Os. Mr. Gladstone, *July 18*, 941, 942, 1000 ; Mr. A. Douglas, 984.

Pickersgill, Mr. E. H. [Bethnal Green, S.W.]
Elementary School Teachers, Inadequate Supply of, *July 11*, 114, 115.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No.1) Bill.
c. 2R.* *July 16*, 511.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill.
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 11*, 1 ; *July 16*, 465.
Com. July 17*, 650.
Rep. July 18*, 809.
3R.* *July 22*, 1078.
c. 1R.* *July 22*, 1126.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No.3) Bill.
l. Rep July 11*, 2.
3R.* *July 15*, 261.
c. 1R.* *July 15*, 300.
2R.* *July 23*, 1310.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill.
l. Rep. July 11*, 2.
3R.* *July 15*, 262.
c. 1R.* *July 15*, 301.
2R.* *July 23*, 1310.

Piers and Harbours
[*See also names of Places.*]
Ireland—Development on North-West and West Coasts.
Q. Mr. McHugh ; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 22*, 1184.

Pirie, Mr. D. O. [Aberdeen, N.]
- Channel Fleet, Strength of, *July 16*, 521.

Police
- Metropolitan.
  - Commission Report, Date of Issuing. *Os.* Mr. A. Douglas, *July 18*, 982; Mr. Gladstone, 1,000.
  - Dublin Police, *see under* Dublin.
  - Study of Yiddish by. *Q.* Mr. Starkey; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 22*, 1169, 1170.

Pollock Estate
- Sale Proposals for. *Q.* Mr. Hazleton; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 1154.

Pontypridd Urban District Council Bill
- *c.* 2R.* *July 12*, 193.

Poor Law
- Audit of Metropolitan Accounts. *Q.* Mr. S. Samuel; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 18*, 899, 900.
- Children, Statistics as to. *Qs.* Mr. P. Pease; *As.* Mr. Burns, *July 23*, 1361.
- Ireland
  - Reform—Proposals as to carrying out Report of the Viceregal Commission.
    - *Os.* Lord Monteagle of Brandon, *July 22*, 1105–1111, 1123; Lord Castletown, 1111–1113; Earl of Mayo, 1113–1116; Earl of Crewe, 1116–1120, 1121; Earl of Meath, 1120; Lord Ashbourne, 1121; Lord Denman, 1122.
  - Relief Statistics (1907–8), Return ordered, *July 16*, 513.
- Scottish Statistics (1906–1907)—Return ordered, *July 17*, 662.
- Workhouses, *see that title.*

Portishead District Water Bill
- *c.* 2R.* *July 15*, 300.

Portobello and Musselburgh Tramways (Levenhall Extension) Order Confirmation Bill.
- *c.* 2R.* *July 11*, 33.
- *Com.** *July 15*, 300.
- 3R.* *July 17*, 660.

Portsmouth, Earl of—*Under-Secretary of State for War.*
- Cavalry, Divisional—Adequacy of proposed Training, *July 17*, 659.
- Militia Special Reserve
  - Enlistment, Terms of, *July 15*. 268.
  - Rate of Pay and Qualifications, *July 15*, 268.

Portsmouth, Earl of—*cont.*
- Territorial Force
  - Ballot Act, Powers of Enforcing, *July 17*, 655.
  - Establishment, Proposals as to, *July 17*, 655.
  - Musketry Training, Regulations as to, *July 17*, 651, 653.
  - Total Strength available for Home Defence, *July 17*, 656, 658.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep.*, *July 18*, 811, 813–821, 824, 825, 826, 827, 843, 844, 849, 851, 853, 854, 870–873, 875, 879, 885, 886, 889, 892; 3R., *July 23*, 1300, 1302, 1305, 1307, 1308.
  - Forms of Attestation for Enlistment—Tabling, *July 15*, 268.
- Volunteers—Total Strength on 1st June, 1907, *July 15*, 268.

Portugal
- Treaty of August, 1890, Terms of. *Q.* Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 12*, 196.

Post Office
- *Postmaster-General*—Rt. Hon. S. Buxton.
- [*See also* Names of Places.]
- Basket Contract, Terms of. *Q.* Mr. Clynes; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 17*, 692.
- Complaints against Postmen, Procedure in dealing with. *Q.* Mr. Steadman; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 19*, 1022, 1023.
- Contracts—Observance of Fair Wages Clause. *Q.* Mr. W. T. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 22*, 1144, 1145.
- Foreign and Colonial Post Amendment (No. 17) Warrant Presented, *July 15*, 263, 302.
- General Post Office New Building, Construction of. *Q.* Mr. Whitehead; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *July 15*, 336.
- Grievances of Employees—Date of presenting Report. *Q.* Mr. Wiles; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 16*, 515.
- Injuries to Officials, Compensation for. *Q.* Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Capt. Norton, *July 22*, 1175.
- Mail Service
  - P. & O. Contract, Terms of. *Qs.* Mr. H. Cox, Mr. Smeaton; *As.* Capt. Norton, *July 22*, 1175, 1176.
  - Shanghai, Routes to. *Q.* Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 22*, 1144.

[*cont.*

Post Office—*cont.*
Parcel Post
Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 7), Warrant Presented, *July 15*, 263, 302.
Peru—Warrant Presented, *July 18*, 810, 894.
Sub-Postmasters' Letter-boxes, Payment for Cost of Fixing.
Q. Mr. W. T. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 18*, 901.

Post Office Savings Bank
Deficiency, Suggestion for Meeting.
Q. Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 18*, 918.
Rates of Interest, Reduction of.
Q. Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 18*, 917.

Post Offices Sites Bill
c. Com., *July 19*, 1032.
Rep., *July 19*, 1049.
l. 1R.* *July 22*, 1083.

Powell, Sir F. S. [Wigan]
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 1398.
Telegraph (Money) Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 1025.

Power, Mr. P. J. [Waterford, E.]
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 24*, 1652.
Fisheries, Scottish—Protection afforded by Gunboats, *July 22*, 1182.
Ordnance Survey—Civil Assistants, Position of, *July 22*, 1148.
Taxation — Grievances of Surveyors' Clerks, *July 18*, 925.

President of the Board of Agriculture
Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.

President of the Board of Education
Rt. Hon R. McKenna.

President of the Board of Trade
Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George.

President of the Local Government Board
Rt. Hon. J. Burns.

Prevention of Cruelty to Children Bill
Facilities for.
Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 23*, 1370.

Price, Mr. C. E. [Edinburgh, Central]
China Concessions, Negotiations as to, *July 18*, 913.
Finance Bill, *Con.*, *July 16*, 550-552, 558.
Income-tax — Notices of Assessment in England and Scotland, *July 16*, 551, 558.

Price, Mr. C. E.—*cont.*
Leith Burghs Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *July 16*, 610-612.
Naval Vessels visiting Home Ports, *July 23*, 1340.

Prisons
[*See also names of places.*]
Chains and Cross Irons, Number of Prisoners wearing.
Q. Mr. Hazleton; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 24*, 1582, 1583.
Flogging in.
Q. Mr. Luttrell; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 23*, 1360.
Ireland—Salaries of Warders.
Q. Mr. Meehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 17*, 699, 700.
Weak-minded Prisoners, Treatment of.
Q. Mr. Alden; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 22*, 1170.

Probate Fees
Age of Order, etc.
Q. Sir E. Cornwall; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 22*, 1150.

Prohibition of Medical Practice by Companies Bill
c. 1R.* *July 24*, 1600.

Public Accounts Committee
Report, Publication of, in the Press.
Q. Mr. Bowles; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *July 22*, 1181.
Reports brought up and read, *July 15*, 347; *July 23*, 1375.

Public Heath Act
Defaulting Local Authorites dealt with in 1906.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 23*, 1331.

Public Heath Bill
c. Re-committal agreed to, *July 24*, 1752.

Public Health (Scotland) Amendment Bill
l. 1R* *July 22*, 1123.

Public Trustee
Appointment of.
Qs. Mr. Bottomley, Mr. MacNeill; *As.* Sir J. Walton, *July 16*, 542, 543.
Qs. Mr. Bottomley; *As.* Sir J. Walton, *July 24*, 1585.

Public Works Loans Bill
Introduction, Date of.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 11*, 48.

Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) Bill
l. Com., *July 11*, 3.
*Rep.** *July 11*, 23; *July 16*, 472.
3R.* *July 23*, 1283.

Qualification of Women (County and Town Councils) (Scotland) Bill
l. 2R., *July 15*, 264.
Com., *July 22*, 1085.
*Rep.** *July 23*, 1309.

Questions
Asking by one Member on behalf of another.
Os. Mr. MacNeill, Mr. Speaker, Col. Lockwood, *July 11*, 57, 58.
Irrelevant, *July 11*, 46; *July 17*, 683; *July 18*, 926, 927; *July 23*, 1358.
Notice to be given of, *July 15*, 311; *July 17*, 683, 689, 706, 707; *July 24*, 1589.
Out of Order, *July 11*, 61.
Right to Demand Information.
Os. Mr. O'Grady, Mr. Speaker, *July 16*, 529.
Speech may not be made during time for, *July 24*, 1572.
Supplementary, Reading of.
Os. Mr. Lynch, Mr. Speaker, *July 16*, 529.

Radford, Mr. G. H. [Islington, E.]
High Court of Justice, State of Business in, Necessity for Appointment of Additional Judge, etc., *July 11*, 230.
London County Council (General Power) Bill, *Con.*, *July 11*, 127, 137.

Radio-Telegraphic Convention
See under Wireless Telegraphy.

Raglan, Lord
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep.*, *July 18*, 847, 850, 879–883, 888.

Railways
Ireland—Report Presented, *July 22*, 1081, 1129.
Light Railway Commissioners, Names of, etc.
Q. Mr. Clough; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *July 23*, 1362, 1363.
Safety Appliances—Report Presented, *July 24*, 1525, 1563.
Volunteer Officers, Fares charged to.
Q. Mr. Starkey; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 17*, 681.

Rainy, Mr. A. R. [Kilmarnock Burghs]
Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *July 16*, 627.

Randles, Sir J. [Cumberland, Cockermouth]
Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1734.
Workmen's Compensation Act—Effect on Employment of Epileptics, *July 15*, 327.

Rates and Rating
Collection—Cost of Legal Proceedings.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A* Mr. Gladstone, *July 23*, 1328, 1329.

Rawlinson, Mr. J. F. P. [Cambridge University]
Criminal Appeal Bill. *Con.*, *July 19*, 1069–1073.
Finance Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 190; *Con.*, *July 16*, 576, 579, 594, 598.
Income-tax
Earned Incomes, Inclusion of Pensions and Annuities, *July 16*, 594, 598.
Incomes which have already paid Tax in the Colonies, Exemption of, proposed, *July 16*, 579.
Married Persons, Assessing Incomes separately, proposed, *July 11*, 190; *July 16*, 576.
Telegraph (Money) Bill, *Con.*, *July 12*, 243, 258.

Rawtenstall Corporation Bill
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.** *July 12*, 193.

Rea, Mr. W. R. [Scarborough]
Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *July 16*, 604–607, 611.

Redmond, Mr. J. E. [Waterford]
Business of the House, Course of, *July 23* 1372.
Education, Intermediate, Discussion on, *July 17*, 694, 695.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 732–736; *July 22*, 1271, 1276, 1277; *July 23*, 1451.
Allocation of Time, *July 22*, 1198–1202.
Amendment omitted from Record in "Votes and Proceedings," *July 23*, 1371.
Land Purchase—Correspondence between Mr. W. Moore and Mr. Commissioner Bailey, *July 23*, 1451–1453.
Public Works Loans Bill—Date of Introduction, *July 11*, 48.

Redmond, Mr. W. H. K. [Clare, E.]
Butter and Margarine Bill—Effect on Irish Butter Trade, *July 15*, 339.
Clare Potato Crop, *July 15*, 339.
Cromer, Lord, Grant to, *July 11*, 62, 63.
Dartmoor Prison—Sentences on Certain Prisoners, *July 17*, 688.
Doonass Property—Case of Mrs. M. Shearin, *July 24*, 1592.
Education
Secondary Education—New Regulations issued in Connection with, *July 11*, 97–100.
Training Colleges, Hostels in Connection with—Government Policy as to, *July 11*, 98–100.
Soldiers, Civil Employment of—Timekeeper on Devonshire Estates, *July 23*, 1343.

Rees, Mr. J. D. [Montgomery Boroughs]
 Africa, Central
  British Laws running in, *July 22*, 1141.
  Troops in Zomba, *July 22*, 1167.
 Africa, East—Under-Secretary's Visit to, *July 24*, 1579.
 Baghdad Customs Arrangements, *July 11*, 46.
 China Railway Contracts, Negotiations as to, *July 15*, 321.
 Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 1053.
 Egyptian Affairs, Discussion on, *July 11*, 59.
 Foreign Office Vote, Discussion of, *July 16*, 546.
 High Court of Justice—State of Business in, Necessity for Appointment of additional Judge, etc., *July 12*, 235.
 India
  Johar Mandel, Case of, *July 16*, 530.
  Orissa Records, Revision of, *July 15*, 309.
  "Rack Taxing in Rural India," Publication of, *July 16*, 531.
 Macedonian Outrages, Punishment for, *July 11*, 44.
 Persian Gulf, British Naval Vessels in, *July 17*, 680.
 Telegraph (Money) Bill, *Con.*, *July 12*, 250.
 Trinidad Indentured Immigrants, Crimes of, *July 17*, 685.
 Turkey
  Customs Increase, Revenue from, *July 23*, 1356.
  German Financial Proposals, *July 15*, 324, 325.
 War Office Clothing Contracts placed with Welsh Firms, *July 22*, 1159.
 Welshpool Burial Ground, *July 24*, 1581.

Reformatory and Industrial Schools
 Conditions of detaining Children in.
  Qs. Mr. Sloane; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 24*, 1591, 1592.

Rendall, Mr. A. [Gloucester, Thornbury]
 Companies Bill, Proposals as to, *July 15*, 308.

Renfrewshire Upper District (Eastwood and Mearns) Water Bill
 l. Rep. July 16*, 511.

Revenue and Expenditure
 Income and Expenditure (1892-3—1906-7)—Return Ordered, *July 11*, 35.
  Return Presented, *July 17*, 662.

Rhodesia
 Rabies, Measures taken to deal with.
  Qs Mr. Ridsdale; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 22*, 1164.

Ribblesdale, Lord
 Bills
  Date of Receiving, allowing Adequate Time for Discussion, etc., *July 15*, 282.
  Initiation of more Measures in House of Lords, proposed, *July 15*, 282.
 Business of the House, Progress made with, *July 15*, 281.
 Crown Estates converted into Small Holdings, Alleged Dispossession of Tenants, *July 16*, 510.
 Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep.*, *July 18*, 830.

Richards, Mr. T. F. [Wolverhampton, W.]
 Birmingham Post Office, Allocation of Duties in, *July 18*, 896.

Richmond (Surrey) Electricity Supply Bill
 l. Rep. July 16*, 465.
 3R.* *July 22*, 1077.

Ridsdale, Mr. E. A. [Brighton]
 Rhodesia, Rabies in, *July 22*, 1164.

Riverstown
 Postal Facilities in District.
  Q. Mr. A. Roche; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 16*, 516, 517.

Roberts, Earl
 Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep.*, *July 18*, 820, 836, 843.

Roberts, Mr. G. H. [Norwich]
 Children, Employment of—Operation of Order No. 680, *July 16*, 538.

Roberts, Mr. S. [Sheffield, Ecclesall]
 Cocoa Duty, Abolition of, proposed, *July 11*, 177–179.
 Education
  Schools, Erection of—Applications for Grants, *July 22*, 1179.
  Welsh Code, etc., Issue of, *July 22*, 1180.
 Finance Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 177–179, *Con.*, *July 16*, 640, 647.
 Hague Conference and the International Limitation of Armaments, *July 23*, 1358.
 Income-tax
  Business discontinued, Three Years Average Assessment, *July 16*, 647.
  Three Years Average System, Working of, *July 16*, 640.

Robertson, Rt. Hon. E.—*Secretary to the Admiralty* [Dundee]
 Admiralty Contracts
  Clothing Contracts placed with Scottish Firms, *July 17*, 675.
  Wages paid by Certain Firms, *July 16*, 517.

[*cont.*

Robertson, Rt. Hon. E.—*cont.*
- "Alexandra" Upholstery Contract, *July 17*, 681.
- American Visit of Cruisers, Period of, &c., *July 24*, 1568.
- Battleships and Cruisers with Nucleus Crews, Complements of, *July 15*, 313.
- "Blake," "Blenheim," and "Renown" Armament of, *July 11*, 41.
- Boys, Sea-training of, *July 15*, 303.
- Channel Fleet
  - Scouts, &c., Attached to, *July 15*, 305, 312.
  - Strength of, *July 15*, 305, 311.
- Colonial Stations, Vessels for, *July 17*, 680.
- "Cumberland," Docking of, *July 11*, 38.
- Dock Accommodation for Large Battleships, *July 16*, 514.
- Electricians, Badge for, *July 17*, 666.
- Guns, 12-pounder, Reason for Reducing, *July 11*, 40.
- "Indefatigable" and "Scylla," Destination of, and Marines in, *July 11*, 39.
- "King Edward VII," Defective Rudder Supplied to, *July 11*, 38.
  - Reward of Informant, *July 17*, 667.
- Malta Torpedo-boat Flotilla, Strength of, *July 15*, 314.
- Manœuvres during last Five Years, *July 15*, 306.
- Mobilisation under New Scheme, *July 15*, 311, 312, 314.
- Persian Gulf, British Naval Vessels in, *July 17*, 680.
- "Renown," Armament of, *July 11*, 40.
- Sail Drill, &c., Reintroduction of, *July 17*, 681.
- St. Helena, Naval Visits to, *July 22*, 1139.
- "Scylla," Condition of, *July 17*, 681.
- Shipbuilding Programme, *July 11*, 38.
- Submarines, Contracts for, *July 15*, 310, 311.
- Torpedo-boat Crews, Medical Examination of, *July 22*, 1130.
- West Indies Naval Force, *July 11*, 39; *July 15*, 313, 314.

Robertson, Mr. J. M. [Northumberland. Tyneside]
- Egypt
  - Bemba, Turkish Troops in, *July 23*, 1357.
  - Census, Taking of, *July 16*, 534.
  - Educational Posts, Egyptians in, *July 18*, 915.
  - Khedivial School of Law, Evening Classes and Rectorship, *July 16*, 535, 536; *July 23*, 1358.
  - Postal Rates, *July 18*, 914; *July 23*, 1356.
  - Regent, Identity of, *July 23*, 1357.

Robertson, Mr. J. M.—*cont.*
- Foreign Office Vote, Discussion of, *July 16*, 546.
- India—Plague, Practice of Inoculation, *July 22*, 1133.

Roche, Mr. A. [Cork]
- Riverstown District Postal Facilities, *July 16*, 516.

Roche, Mr. J. [Galway, E.]
- Derrahiney Untenanted Land, Purchase of, *July 15*, 342.

Ronaldshay, Lord
- Colonial Preference—Government Attitude towards, *July 15*, 392–399.

Roscommon
- Agrarian Cases, Change of Venue for Trying.
  - *Qs.* Mr. J. Campbell; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *July 17*, 705, 706.

Ross-shire
- Schools Water Supply.
  - *Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 22*, 1141.

Rosyth Naval Base
- *See under* Navy.

Ruan
- Disturbances on 14th inst.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 18*, 928, 929.

Runciman, Mr. W.—*Financial Secretary to the Treasury* [Dewsbury]
- Agriculture Department, Working of—Cost of Inquiry, *July 24*, 1564.
- Brewing—Use of Hop Substitutes, *July 16*, 541.
- British Museum Literary Section, Cost of, *July 17*, 675.
- Cardboard Boxes—Import Regulations, *July 15*, 336.
- China—Railway Contracts, Negotiations as to, *July 15*, 321.
- Civil Service
  - Boy Clerks, Position of, *July 15*, 337.
  - Clerical Appointment System, Revision of, *July 18*, 896.
- Colonies, British Consuls in, *July 15*, 320.
- County Court Fees, *July 16*, 540.
- Estimates, Supplementary—Date of issue, *July 23*, 1364.
- Exchequer and Audit Department
  - Colonial Audit Branch, Clerks Employed in, *July 24*, 1567.
  - Colonial Inspection Tour, Necessity for, *July 18*, 898.
- Government Department Clerks, Information as to, *July 22*, 1156.
- Hague Conference—British Delegates, Instructions to, *July* 24, 1580.

Runciman, Mr. W.—*cont.*
Ireland
National School Teachers, Insurance of, *July 17*, 673.
Public Works Loans, *July 16*, 516.
Kerry Railway Guarantees, *July 24*, 1566.
Land Tax Commissioners appointed, *July 24*, 1585.
Macedonia, Budget Deficit—Security for Loan, *July 15*, 322, 323.
Parliamentary Debates, Reporting of, *July 22*, 1148.
Pensions—Rule as to Commutation, *July 18*, 899.
Public Works Loans Bill—Date of Introduction, *July 11*, 48.
Sugar, Home-grown, Surtax on, *July 11*, 49.
Taxation — Grievances of Surveyor's Clerks, *July 18*, 926.
Turkey
Customs Increase — Assent of the Powers, *July 15*, 321.
German Financial Proposals, *July 15*, 325.
Ottoman Public Debt, Council of, *July 15*, 323, 324.
Railways—Grants-in-aid, *July 15*, 324.

Russell, Earl
Divorce Bills—Granting Return as to, *July 16*, 490–494.
Motors, Proposals as to Fresh Legislation for, *July 16*, 483–486.
Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 14.

Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.—*Vice President of Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department* [Tyrone, S.]
Ardglass Harbour, Danger from Churn Rock, *July 22*, 1147.
Butter and Margarine Bill—Effect on Irish Butter Trade, *July 15*, 339.
Clare Potato Crops, *July 15*, 340.
Dairy Industry, Encouragement of, *July 22*, 1183.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 22*, 1258, 1262; *July 23*, 1450.
Fisheries — Protection of North Coast, *July 22*, 1184.
Horse-breeding, Schemes for, *July 24*, 1587.
Land Purchase—Correspondence between Mr. W. Moore and Commissioner Bailey, *July 23*, 1454, 1458.
Milk—Facilities for sending to England, *July 15*, 340, 341.
Piers and Harbours on North-West and West Coasts, *July 22*, 1184.
Timber Clearances in Ireland, *July 11*, 50.

Russia
Odessa—Assault on Mr. T. Hutchinson.
Qs. Major Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 18*, 916.

Russo-Japanese War
"Knight Commander" Case.
Qs. Major Anstruther-Gray, Mr. Hart-Davies; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 16*, 533.

Rutherford, Dr. V. H. [Middlesex, Brentford]
Egypt
Affairs of, Parliamentary Discussion on, *July 11*, 59.
Khedivial School of Law, Rectorship of, *July 16*, 535; *July 22*, 1169.
Plague, Deaths from, *July 11*, 44.
India—Plague
Deaths from, *July 16*, 531.
Medical Staff to deal with, *July 11*, 42.
Macedonian Outrages, Punishment for, *July 11*, 44.
Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill, *Com.*, *July 24*, 1743–1750.
Natal—Assault committed by J. Leask, *July 24*, 1578.
School Hygiene Congress Arrangements, *July 15*, 335.
Transvaal
Johannesburg Tramway By-law, *July 11*, 43.
Workmen's Compensation Bill, *July 24*, 1578.

Rutherford, Mr. W. W. [Liverpool, West Derby]
Finance Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 643.
Income-tax — Business discontinued, Three Years Average Assessment, *July 16*, 643.

Rye Bay
Illegal Fishing in.
Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 16*, 522.

St. Aldwyn, Viscount
Advertisements Regulation Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 26, 27.
Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 19.

St. Asaph
Sanitary Condition of District.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 23*, 1331.

St. Helena
Farmers, Assistance to.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 22*, 1139, 1140.
Grant-in-aid, Proposals for.
Qs. Sir G. Parker; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 1349, 1350.

[*cont.*

St. Helena—*cont.*
Labour for the Transvaal, Conditions of supplying.
Q. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 22*, 1168.
Legal Appeal Expenses.
Q. Mr. Sloan ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 22*, 1140, 1141.
Magistrate's Salary.
Q. Mr. Sloan ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 22*, 1140.
Naval Visits to.
Q. Mr. Sloan ; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 22*, 1139.
Police Force.
Q. Mr. Sloan ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 22*, 1139.
Roads, Maintenance of.
Qs. Major Anstruther-Gray ; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 15*, 317.
Trading Facilities with Cape Colony.
Q. Sir G. Parker ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 15*, 319.
War Department Property, Care of.
Qs. Mr. L. Hardy, Major Anstruther-Gray ; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 15*, 315.
Zulu Prisoners
Condition of.
Qs. Mr. J. R. Macdonald ; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 18*, 897, 912.
Treatment of.
Qs. Mr. J. R. Macdonald, Mr. Byles ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 18*, 911, 912.

Salisbury, Marquess of
Army—Territorial Force
Musketry Training, Regulations as to, *July 17*, 652, 653.
Property, Trusts, etc., Decision as to handing over to County Association, *July 16*, 495.
Board of Education Scheme (Hulme Trust Estates Educational) Confirmation Bill, 2R., *July 22*, 1080.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep.*, *July 18*, 829, 872, 876–879, 886-889 ; 3R., *July 23*, 1306, 1308.

Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill
l. 3R.* *July 11*, 32
c. 1R.* *July 16*, 512.

Salter, Mr. C. [Hampshire, Basingstoke]
Criminal Appeal Bill, *Com.*, *July 19*, 1050, 1060.
High Court of Justice, State of Business in, Necessity for Appointment of Additional Judge, etc., *July 12*, 225–230.
Post Office Sites Bill, *Com.*, *July 19*, 1036, 1043.

Samuel, Mr. H. L.—*Under-Secretary, Home Office* [Yorkshire, Cleveland]
Cabs—Charges levied on, Reduction of, proposed, *July 18*, 981.
Electrical Generating Works, Special Regulations for, *July 18*, 978.
Factories and Workshops
Inspectors
Assistant, Improvement in *Status* of, *July 18*, 979.
Class of Men appointed and Tests imposed on, *July 18*, 980.
Visits made and Number of Miles travelled, *July 18*, 978.
Time-cribbing, Progress made with Suppression of, *July 18*, 975.
Fibrosis of the Lungs, Scheduling as an Industrial Disease, proposed, *July 18*, 977.
Fish-curing, Sanitary Conditions of Work, *July 18*, 977.
Fruit-preserving Industry, Hours of Labour, *July 18*, 976.
Lead Poisoning, Increase in Cases—Enforcement of Regulations and use of Leadless Glaze, *July 18*, 976.
Naphtha, Dangers of, Protection of Workers, *July 18*, 977, 978.

Samuel, Mr. S. M. [Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel]
Poor Law Accounts, Audit of, *July 18*, 899.

Sassoon, Sir E. A. [Hythe]
Asia Minor—Safeguarding of British Interests, *July 22*, 1168.
Finance Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 565.
France, Telegraph, etc., Charges to, *July 11*, 48.
India
Railways—Expenditure sanctioned, *July 11*, 42.
Rupees, Coining of, *July 22*, 1133.
Radio-telegraphic Report, Discussion of, *July 18*, 930.
Sugar
Convention—Discussion of British Policy, *July 18*, 931.
Duty, Reduction of, on British and Colonial Sugar, proposed, *July 16*, 565.
Home-grown, Surtax on, *July 11*, 49.
Wireless Telegraphy—Discussion of Radio-telegraphic Convention Report, *July 11*, 61, 62.

Savings Banks
See also Post Office Savings Bank *and titles* Army and Navy.
Deposits in.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy ; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 22*, 1149, 1150.

Scarbrough, Earl of
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep.*, *July 18*, 852.

Scotland
Secretary for—Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.
Lord Advocate—Rt. Hon. T. Shaw.
Solicitor-General—Mr. A. Ure.
[*For* particular Places, *see their names.*]
Appeals System, Revision of, proposed. *Q.* Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. T. Shaw, *July 17*, 693, 694.
Ecclesiastical Assessment — Legislative Proposals. *Q.* Mr. Menzies; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 15*, 337, 338.
Education, *see that title.*
Estimates, *see that title.*
Feu Duties and Long Building Leases. *Q.* Mr. Menzies; *A.* Mr. Shaw, *July 24*, 1586.
House-letting System—Date of presenting Report. *Q.* Mr. Cleland; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 22*, 1183.
Public Parks, Administration of. *Q.* Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Shaw, *July 24*, 1586, 1587.
Rateable Property in. *Q.* Mr. Menzies; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 24*, 1568.

Scott, Sir S. E. [Marylebone, W.]
Cabs, Reduction of Charges levied on, proposed, *July 18*, 970.
Civil Service Pensions—Counting of Military Service, *July 22*, 1138.
Telegraph Messengers, Employment for, *July 22*, 1145.
Yeomanry, Armament of, *July 22*, 1138.

Scottish Standard
Rules as to displaying. *Qs.* Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 16*, 543, 544.

Seaverns, Mr. J. H. [Lambeth, Brixton]
Parliamentary Debates, Reporting of, *July 22*, 1148.

Secretary of State for the Colonies
Rt. Hon. Earl of Elgin.

Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs
Rt. Hon. Sir E. Grey.

Secretary of State for the Home Department
Rt. Hon. H. Gladstone.

Secretary of State for India
Rt. Hon. J. Morley.

Secretary for Scotland
Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.

Secretary of State for War
Rt. Hon. H. B. Haldane.

Seddon, Mr. J. R. [Lancashire, S.W., Newton]
Midland Railway Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 986.

Seely, Major J. E. B. [Liverpool, Abercomby]
Land Purchase—Correspondence between Mr. W. Moore and Commissioner Bailey, *July 23*, 1457.

Selsey Water Bill
c. Rep., July 18*, 893.

Sewage Disposal
Final Report, Date of Presenting. *Q.* Mr. Mitchell-Thompson; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 22*, 1175.

Shackleton, Mr. D. [Lancashire, N.E., Clitheroe]
Business of the House, Course of, *July 23*, 1374.
Cotton-cloth Factories, Inquiry into Humidity in, *July 18*, 971.
Letter to the "Times" by Member for East St. Pancras—Breach of Privilege, *July 15*, 356.
Time Cribbing, Progress made with Suppression of, *July 18*, 971–975.

Shaw, Rt. Hon T.—*Lord Advocate* [Hawick Burghs]
Appeal System, Revision of, *July 17*, 694.
Feu Duties and Long Building Leases, *July 24*, 1586.
Public Parks, Administration of, *July 24*, 1587.

Sheehan, Mr. D. D. [Cork Co., Mid.]
Labourers Act—Operation of Article 13 of Order, *July 17*, 695.
Labourers Cottages—Inquiry into Rejected Applications, *July 11*, 55.
Mountmellick
Delaney, Case of, *July 16*, 514.
Gaffney, Case of, *July 17*, 694.

Sheep
Valuation of Stocks, Effect of Section 1 of Agricultural Holdings Act, 1906.
Qs. Earl of Camperdown, *July 22*, 1089–1094, 1098, 1100, 1103; Lord Lovat, 1094; Earl Carrington, 1095–1100; Lord Balfour of Burleigh, 1100–1102; Lord Tweedmouth, 1102–1104; Earl Cawdor, 1104, 1105; Earl of Crewe, 1105.

Sheffield, Sir B. [Yorkshire, W.R., Osgoldcross]
Navy
Channel Fleet, Strength of, *July 16*, 521.
"Dreadnought," Broadside fired by, *July 16*, 521.
Torpedo-boat Destroyers, Life of and Number Laid Down, *July 16*, 520.

Sheffield Corporation Bill
*c. Con.** *July 18*, 893.
3R* *July 22*, 1125.

Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Bill
c. 2R* *July 22*, 1280.

Simon, Mr. J. A. [Essex, Walthamstow]
Colonial Preference—Objections to Taxation of Food, *July 15*, 386–392.

Sinclair, Rt. Hon. J.—*Secretary for Scotland* [Forfarshire]
Balintore Harbour, Inspection of, *July 24*, 1563.
Balta Sound—Duties of H.M.S. "Hebe," *July 22*, 1181.
Bass Rock, Valuation of, *July 22*, 1129.
Ecclesiastical Assessment — Legislative Proposals, *July 15*, 338.
Fisheries
Board Superannuation Scheme, *July 12*, 197.
Protection Afforded by Gunboats, *July 22*, 1182.
Fordyce Academy—Dismissal of Rector, *July 15*, 338.
House-Letting System—Date of Presenting Report, *July 22*, 1183.
Kelso—Casualties collected by Superior, *July 23*, 1366.
Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *July 16*, 617–619.
Lewis, Island of
Lunatics, Accommodation for, *July 22*, 1142.
Sanitary Condition, *July 23*, 1333.
Water Supply, *July 22*, 1143.
May Island, Illegal Trawling near, *July 15*, 338, 339.
Old Kilpatrick—Dalmuir Land Purchased for New School, *July 22*, 1182.
Orkney Oyster Order, Report on, *July 16*, 514.
Rateable Property in Scotland, *July 24*, 1568.
"Ringdove," Proposals as to, *July 24*, 1585 1586.
Ross-shire, Schools Water Supply, *July 22*, 1141.
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, Holdings excluded from, *July 23*, 1332.

Singleton Estate
Sale of.
Q. Mr. Nolan ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 15*, 304.

Sligo
Fish-Curing Stations, Decision as to.
Q. Mr. McHugh ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 1136.
Piers, Slips, etc., Expenditure on.
Q. Mr. McHugh ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 1136, 1137.

Sloan, Mr. T. H. [Belfast, S.]
Belfast
Death-rate Inquiry, *July 15*, 346.
Dock Strike, Intervention of the Military Authorities, *July 18*, 1019.
Postal Telegraph Staff Duties, *July 18*, 900.
Constabulary—Fanning and O'Shee, Cases of, *July 17*, 673, 674.
Education
Annual Inspections, Instructions as to, *July 17*, 672.
National School Teachers
Increments and Promotions, Award of, *July* 17, 703.
Insurance of, *July 17*, 673.
Statistics as to, *July 24*, 1591.
Re-inspection Regulations, *July 17*, 704.
Rule 127 (b), Enforcement of, *July 24*, 1592.
Industrial Schools, Conditions of Detaining Children in, *July 24*, 1591, 1592.
Irvine Estate—Case of J. T. McQuade, *July* 24, 1593.
St. Helena
Farmers, Assistance to, *July 22*, 1139.
Legal Appeal Expenses, *July 22*, 1140.
Magistrate's Salary, *July 22*, 1140.
Naval Visits to, *July 22*, 1139.
Police Force, *July 22*, 1139.

Small Holdings
Crown Estates Converted into—Alleged Dispossession of Tenants — Return as to.
Os. Viscount Hill, *July 16*, 496–498, 510 ; Lord Heneage, 498–502 ; Earl Carrington, 502–508, 510 ; Marquess of Lansdowne, 508–510 ; Lord Ribblesdale, 510.
Scottish Inquiries.
Qs. Sir J. Jardine, Mr. Laidlaw ; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 23*, 1364, 1365.

Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill
Holdings Excluded from.
Q. Mr. M. Ferguson ; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 23*, 1332.

Smeaton, Mr. D. M. [Stirlingshire]
Finance Bill, *Con.*, *July 16*, 594, 595, 597, 599.
Income-tax on Earned Incomes, Inclusion of Pensions, *July 16*, 594, 595, 597, 599.
Midland Railway Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 985.
Post Office Mail Service, Terms of P. & O. Contract, *July 22*, 1176.
Vivisection—Report of Royal Commission, *July 18*, 994–998.

Smith, Mr. F. E. [Liverpool, Walton]
Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 1059.
Edalji Case—Circumstances of, Authorship of Anonymous Letters, etc., *July 18*, 1004–1016.
Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 1497.

Smith, Mr. W. F. D. [Strand, Westminster]
Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.,) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 1494.

Smith, Sir James Brown
Knighthood, Conferred on.
Qs. Mr. Lea, Mr. Belloc, Mr. A. Chamberlain ; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Speaker, *July 11*, 60, 61.

Snowden, Mr. P. [Blackburn]
Education
Schools, Air Space in, *July 11*, 144.
Secondary Education—New Regulations issued in connection with, *July 11*, 143–146.
Worcester Election Petition Expenses, Rate levied for, *July 16*, 547.

Soares, Mr. E. J. [Devon, Barnstaple]
Colonial Preference, Objections to Food Taxation, *July 15*, 376–386.
Volunteers—Conveyance of Devonshire Regiments to Camp, *July 16*, 519.

Solicitor-General
Sir W. S. Robson.

Solicitor-General for Ireland
Mr. R. Barry.

Solicitor-General for Scotland
Mr. A. Ure.

Somaliland
Political Officers, Allowances of.
Q. Capt. Faber ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 1347.

Soudan
Nile Bridge at Khartoum, Proposals for.
Q. Mr. MacNeill ; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 23*, 1355.

South Kensington Technical College
Charter of Incorporation Presented, *July 12*, 194 ; *July 15*, 262.

Speaker and Deputy-Speaker, Rulings of
Colonial Preference Resolution—Propriety of entering on Journals as having been carried *nemine contradicente*, *July 15*, 463.
Correction of Statement, Time for, *July 22*, 1201.
Criminal Appeal Bill
Clause implying indefinite postponement was not necessarily Out of Order, *July 19*, 1057.
Question being that a New Clause be read a Second Time, principle of the Bill could not be discussed, *July 19*, 1054.
Discussion on Amendment must not take place before Amendment was reached, *July 16*, 594, 595, 597.
Elementary Schools in single-school areas, Grant for, *July 11*, 1191.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill
Amendment Omitted from Record in Votes and Proceedings, *July 23*, 1371, 1372.
Irrelevant Matter, *July 22*, 1206, 1216, 1220.
Irrelevant Matter, *July 15*, 383 ; *July 19*, 1027 ; *July 23*, 1519, 1521.
Letter to *The Times* by Member for East St. Pancras—Breach of Privilege, *July 12*, 198 ; *July 15*, 347, 351, 352, 357, 358 ; *July 16*, 549.
Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill—Amendment requiring no Seconder, *July 24*, 1724.
Misleading Statements by Members, *July 23*, 1506.
Motion for Rejection of Bill on ground that it did not contain a certain Clause, was in Order, *July 11*, 125.
Speech Out of Order, *July 16*, 561, 562.

Spicer, Sir A. [Hackney, Central]
Finance Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 185.
Income Tax—Dwelling-houses rented by Ministers of Religion, Allowing Deduction for, *July 11*, 185.

Stafford
New Writ for North-Western Division, *July 15*, 298.

Stamp Duty
Insurance Policies, Reduction of Scale for.
Os. Mr. H. H. Marks, *July 11*, 188, 189 ; Mr. Asquith, 188.
Marine Insurance Policies, Reduction of Scale for, proposed.
Os. Mr. C. Hay, *July 11*, 187, 188 ; Mr. Asquith, 187.

Standing Committees
See under Committees.

Stanmore, Lord
- Fiji—Sale of Lands in Provinces of Rewa and Naitasiri, Circumstances of—Tabling Correspondence, proposed, *July 16*, 473–480, 483.

Starkey, Mr. J. R. [Notts., Newark]
- Mall—Erection of Electric Light Standards, *July 22*, 1180.
- Panama Canal—Contract for Work of Trinidad Labourers, *July 23*, 1351.
- Police, Metropolitan—Study of Yiddish, *July 22*, 1169.
- Railway Fares of Volunteer Officers, *July 17*, 681.

State Reformatories Bill
c. 1R* *July 24*, 1600.

Staveley-Hill, Mr. H. [Staffordshire, Kingswinford]
- Evictions in Ireland—Rejected applications, method of notifying, *July 18*, 928.
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 1375.
- Home Office Vote, Facilities for discussion, *July 18*, 1020.
- Navy—Dockyard discharges since 1906, *July 18*, 907.
- New Hebrides
  - Convention, Licences issued under, *July 16*, 532
  - Inspection of Female and Child Labour, *July 11*, 44.
- Pacific Islanders Act, Amendment of, *July 16*, 547.

Steadman, Mr. W. C. [Finsbury, Central]
- Postman, Procedure in dealing with complaints against, *July 19*, 1022.
- Telegraph (Money) Bill, *Con.*, *July 12*, 243.

Stewart-Smith, Mr. D. [Westmoreland, Kendal]
- Westmoreland, Telephone service charges, *July 22*, 1176.

Stornoway
See under Lewis, Island of.

Strachey, Sir E.—*Treasurer of the Household* [Somerset, S.]
- Agriculture Board, Constitution of, *July 11*, 49.
- Gooseberry Mildew, Measures for dealing with, *July 18*, 902.
- Kew Gardens
  - Designation of Gardeners, *July 16*, 516.
  - Lectures, Attendance at, *July 16*, 541.
- Ordnance Survey, Civil Assistants, Position of, *July 22*, 1149.
- Small Holdings—Scottish inquiries, *July 23*, 1365.

Strachey, Sir E.—*cont.*
- Swine, Irish
  - Diagnosis of Carlow fever case in 1905, *July 11*, 59.
  - Restrictions on importations to England, *July 17*, 708, 709.

Straus, Mr. B. S. [Tower Hamlets, Mile End]
- Cabs, Horse-drawn—Use of Taximeters, *July 15*, 329.
- Hackney Carriage Act, Amendment of, *July 15*, 329.
- Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 1487, 1511–1513.

Sugar
- Brussels Convention
  - Discussion of British policy.
    Q. Sir E. Sassoon; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 18*, 931.
  - Report of Proceedings Presented, *July 17*, 662; *July 18*, 810.
- Duty, Reduction of, on British and Colonial Sugar, proposed.
  Os. Mr. Gretton, *July 16*, 559–562; Sir F. Lowe, 562; Mr. Asquith, 563, 565; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 564; Sir E. Sassoon, 565; Mr. H. Cox, 566; Mr. S. Wortley, 568.
- Return as to Price and Duty (1903–7), Ordered, *July 15*, 464.
- Statistics (1887–1906)—Return ordered, *July 22*, 1128.
- Surtax allowed on Home-grown Sugar.
  Q. Sir E. Sassoon; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 11*, 49.

Summerbell, Mr. T. [Sunderland]
- Durham Schoolmasters holding other Offices, *July 17*, 678.
- Government Department Clothing Contracts, Terms of, *July 18*, 970.
- Infant Mortality, Prevention of, *July 18*, 899.
- Kew Gardens
  - Designation of Gardeners, *July 16*, 516.
  - Lectures, Attendance at, *July 16*, 541.
- Mine Inspectors, System of appointing, *July 18*, 969.
- Sunderland Hairdressers' Application for Closing Order, *July 18*, 922.
- Trinidad
  - Indentured Immigrants, Crimes of, *July 17*, 684, 685.
  - Railway Employees' Grievances, *July 17*, 685.
- Workmen's Compensation Act—Effect on Employment of Aged Workmen, *July 18*, 923.

July 11—*July* 24.

Sunderland
Hairdressers' Application for Closing Order.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 18*, 922.

Sunderland Corporation Bill
*l. Rep.** *July 16*, 465.
3R.* *July 23*, 1281.

Superannuation
Retired Allowances Granted, *July 15*, 263, 302; *July 19*, 1022; *July 22*, 1082.
Retirement—Minute as to certain Retentions Ordered, *July 18*, 895; Presented, *July 19*, 1022.

Supply
See also titles Army Estimates, Civil Service Estimates, Navy Estimates.
Discussion of.
Q. Mr. Harmood-Banner; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 16*, 547.

Swanlinbar
Petty Sessions, Case of Mrs. Prior.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 23*, 1367, 1368.

Swine, Irish
Diagnosis of Carlow Fever Case in 1905.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 11*, 59.
Importations to England, Restrictions on.
Qs. Mr. Boland; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 17*, 708, 709.

Synan Estate
Purchase of Untenanted Land.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 1155.

Talbot, Lord E. [Sussex, Chichester]
Secondary Education—New Regulations issued in connection with, *July 11*, 122, 123.

Tandragee
Case of S. Rainey.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 17*, 701, 702.

Taxation
Income Tax, *see that title.*
Surveyors' Clerks, Grievances of.
Q. Mr. Power; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 18*, 925, 926.

Taximeter Cabs
See under Cabs.

Taylor, Mr. A. [Liverpool, E. Toxteth]
Church of England Worship, Changes in, *July 22*, 1188.
Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *July 16*, 612–615.

Tea Duty
Contribution per Head (1906-7).
Q. Mr. L. Harris; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 17*, 687.
Irish Contribution
Q. Mr. L. Harris; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 22*, 1131, 1132.

Tees Conservancy Bill
*c. Rep.** *July 11*, 34.

Tees Valley (Consolidation) Bill
*c. Con.** *July 11*, 33.
3R.* *July 15*, 299.
l. Commons' Amendts.* *July 16*, 465.

Telegraph Service
See also names of places.
Messengers
Adult Night Messengers, System of paying.
Q. Mr. K. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 18*, 901.
Boy Messengers, Sunday Duty of.
Q. Mr. K. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 18*, 900, 901.
Employment for.
Q. Sir S. Scott; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 22*, 1145.
Telegram Counting — Effect of New Scheme.
Q. Mr. W. T. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 22*, 1145, 1146.

Telegraph (Money) Bill
c. Con. July 12, 237; *July 19*, 1023.
3R. *July 22*, 1225.

Telegraph and Telephone Accounts
System of keeping.
Q. Mr. J. F. Mason; *A.* Capt. Morton, *July 23*, 1363, 1364.

Telephone Service
See also names of places.
Post Offices Connected by Telephone.
Q. Mr. H. Heaton; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 15*, 307.

Tennant, Mr. H. J. [Berwickshire]
Anthrax, Increase in, *July 18*, 965.
Bronzing in Lithographic Factories, Special Regulations for, proposed, *July 18*, 967.
Colonial Office, Revision of Duties in, *July 23*, 1325.
Electrical Generating Works, Special Regulations for, *July 18*, 965, 966.
Factories and Workshops
Accidents, Increase in, *July 18*, 964.
Inspectors—Class of Men appointed and tests imposed on, *July 18*, 963.
Juvenile Offenders, Detention of in Police Stations, *July 18*, 964.
Naphtha, Dangers of, Protection of Workers, *July 18*, 968, 969, 978.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill
- *l. Rep.*, *July 18*, 811.
  - 3R.* *July 23*, 1285.
- *Debates on Report* [Lords], *July 18*, 811; *Third Reading, July 23*, 1285.
  - Cadet Corps and Rifle Clubs, no Financial Assistance to be given in respect to Persons under Sixteen, proposed, 813 824.
  - County Associations
    - Chairman and Vice-Chairman
      - Appointment of, to rest with Army Council for first three years, proposed, 1300–1302.
      - Remuneration, 811–813.
    - Cost of, 1289–1292, 1296.
    - Deferring establishment of, proposed, 1292–1295.
    - Duties and Powers of, 1292–1295.
    - First Appointments, Powers as to, 1294, 1305–1307.
    - Joint Committees, Power to appoint, 826.
    - Members not to be under Pecuniary Liability, 825.
    - Property transferred to, Allocation of, 1308.
    - Regulations as to Mobilisation to be issued not later than 1st January, 1909, proposed, 1302–1304.
  - Custody of Arms and Equipment to rest with the Associations, 824.
  - Financial Control over Expenditure in connection with the Territorial Forces, 1289–1292, 1296–1298.
  - Militia
    - Application of Provisions of Part III. of the Act to be deferred for two years, proposed, 854–885.
    - Conditions of Service under New Scheme, 857–885, 1285.
    - Special Contingent, Transfer to and Enlistment into, Conditions of, 871, 872, 877, 885, 889.
    - Trophy Tax, Continuance of, 891, 892.
  - Mobilisation, Requirements for to be embodied in the Regulations, 824, 825.
  - Orders in Council to be laid before both Houses of Parliament, 853, 854, 890, 891.
  - Protest against passing of the Bill, 1285–1287.
  - Schemes to be laid before both Houses of Parliament, 811.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—*cont.*
- *Debates on Report* [Lords]—*cont.*
  - Special Reserve
    - Enlistment into Regular Army to be deemed a Discharge from the Army Reserve, 889.
    - Musketry Training for, 885-889.
  - Territorial Force
    - Billeting in Premises other than Public Houses, proposed, 848–851.
    - Calling out in aid of the Civil Power, Question as to, 851–853.
    - Field Officers, Exemption from Duty of serving as High Sheriff, 853.
    - Foreign Service, Liability for to be explained prior to Attestation, 844–848.
    - Staff Sergeants and Adjutants to be Members of the Regular Forces, 827–842.
    - Total Strength of, 1288.
  - Volunteers, Strength of, 855, 856.
- Forms of Attestation for Enlistment—Tabling.
  - *Os.* Duke of Bedford, *July 15*, 267; Earl of Portsmouth, 268.

Thorne, Mr. W. [West Ham, S.]
- Brighton Unemployed Funds, Expenditure of, *July 18*, 923.
- Gas Light and Coke Company, Meter Rents charged, *July 22*, 1174.
- Netherfield—Saville's Crossing Accident, *July 22*, 1173.
- West Ham—Case of W. Page, *July 18*, 919.

Titles
- Taxation of, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. Bottomley; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 11*, 63.

Tobacco
- Revenue (1906-7).
  - *Q.* Mr. Lea; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 17*, 668.

Tottenham Estate
- Fox, J., Case of.
  - *Q.* Mr. McHugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 22*, 1135.
- Sale, Proposals for.
  - *Q.* Mr. McHugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 15*, 341.

Trachoma
- Measures taken to check.
  - *Q.* Mr. L. Harris; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 17*, 691.

Trade, Board of
- *President*—Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George.
- *Parliamentary Secretary*—Mr. H. E. Kearley.

Trade Reports
Annual Series Presented *July 11*, 2, 35; *July 15*, 262, 302; *July 16*, 466, 512; *July 17*, 662; *July 18*, 810, 894; *July 22*, 1080, 1126; *July 24*, 1525, 1563.

Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill
c. 2R.* *July 23*, 1310.

Transvaal
British Civil Servants, Position of.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 1350, 1351.
Chinese Labourers, Repatriation, Cost of.
Qs. Capt. Faber: *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July*, *23*, 1325.
Johannesburg
Tramway By-law—Application of Section 39 of Letters Patent.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 11*, 43.
Troops employed in.
Qs. Mr. Mond; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 17*, 686.
Loan of £5,000,000
Issue of.
Qs. Sir G. Parker, Mr. P. Pease; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 1348.
Transvaal Bill, Proposals as to.
Qs. Capt. Faber; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 1347, 1348.
Mines
Labour for, *see also subheadings* Chinese, Native, *and* White Labour.
British Labour, Conditions of importing.
Q. Sir. G. Parker; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 24*, 1577.
Conditions of importing.
Q. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 17*, 686, 687.
Replacement of Vacancies caused by Repatriation of Chinese.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 15*, 320.
Report of Committee.
Qs. Mr. Fell; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 23*, 1353.
Strike—Present Situation.
Qs. Mr. Mackarness, Mr. Cox; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 22*, 1166, 1167.
Rupees—Payment of Mining Wages in, proposed.
Q. Mr. Hay; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July*, *23*, 1353.
Workmen's Compensation Bill, Provisions of
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 24*, 1578.

Treasurer of the Household
Sir E. Strachey.

Treasury
First Lord—Rt. Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.
Financial Secretary—Mr. W. Runciman.

Treaty Series
Index (1902-1903) Presented, *July 15*, 262, 302.

Tredegar, Baron
Introduced to House of Lords, *July 16*, 465.

Trevelyan, Mr. C. P. [Yorks, W.R., Elland]
Giggleswick and Rathmell Charities, Administration of, *July 23*, 1364.
Motor Track at Brooklands, Traffic in Vicinity of, *July 23*, 1361.

Trinidad
Indentured Immigrants, Crimes of.
Qs. Mr. Summerbell, Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 17*, 684, 685.
Panama Canal, Labour for, *see* Panama Canal.
Railway Employees' Grievances.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 17*, 685.

Trustee Savings Bank
Returns (1905-6) ordered, *July 17*, 663.

Turkey
Abbott Case—Repayment of Ransom.
Qs. Maj. Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 16*, 533, 534.
Customs Increase
Allocation of Revenue from
Qs. Mr. Lynch; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 23*, 1354.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 23*, 1356.
Assent of the Powers to.
Q. Mr. Lynch; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 15*, 321.
German Financial Proposals in.
Qs. Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *July 15*, 324, 325.
Ottoman Public Debt—Council of.
Qs. Mr. Lynch; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *July 15*, 323, 324.
Railways—Grants-in-Aid.
Q. Mr. Lynch; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 15*, 324.
Trade Reports Presented, *July 22*, 1080.

Turnour, Lord [Sussex, Horsham]
Army—Territorial Force, Colours for, *July 15*, 315.
Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 1054.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 754-756.

[*cont.*

Turnour, Lord—*cont.*
Factories, Label-licking in, *July 15*, 333.
Lynch case—Reason for granting Pardon, *July 15*, 328.
Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill, *Con.*, July 24, 1740.
Telegraph (Money) Bill, *Con.*, *July 12*, 241, 251–253.

Tweedmouth, Lord—*First Lord of the Admiralty*
Sheep, Valuation of Stocks, Effect of Section 1 of Agricultural Holdings Act, 1906, *July 22*, 1102–1104.

Tynemouth Corporation (Water) Bill
c. Con. July 19*, 1021.
3R.* *July 23*, 1309.

United Methodist Church Bill
c. 3R.* *July 12*, 193.
l. Commons Amendments, *Con.**, *July 15*, 261.

United States
Trade Report Presented, *July 11*, 2; *July 15*, 262.

University Colleges
Grant-in-Aid—Minutes Ordered *July 23*, 1311. Presented, *July 24*, 1563.

Vaccination
Calves Hired for Production of Lymph.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 22*, 1146.
Exemption Certificate Fees, Disposal of
Q. Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 17*, 691.

Vagrancy
Proposals as to Legislation.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 24*, 1598.

Valuation (Scotland) Bill
l. 1R.* *July 18*, 1123.

Vivisection
Report of Royal Commission.
Os. Mr. Smeaton, *July 18*, 994–998; Mr. A. Douglas, 998; Mr. Gladstone, 1000, 1001.

Volunteers
Devonshire Regiments—Arrangements for Conveyance to Camp.
Q. Mr. Soares; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 16*, 519, 520.
Essex Royal Garrison Artillery, Armament of.
Q. Col. Lockwood; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 15*, 307.
Position under Workmen's Compensation Act.
Q. Mr. Bridgeman; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 23*, 1344.

Volunteers—*cont.*
Reduction Proposals.
Q. Mr. Arnold-Forster; *A.*, Mr. Haldane, *July 22*, 1159.
Total Strength on 1st June, 1907.
Os. Duke of Bedford; Earl of Portsmouth, *July 15*, 268.

"Votes and Proceedings"
Accuracy of, Omission of Amendment from Record of Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill.
Os. Mr. Mooney, Mr. J. Redmond, *July 23*, 1371; Mr. Speaker, 1371, 1372; Mr. Clancy, Mr. Moore, 1372.

Wages
Foreign Countries, Statistics as to.
Q. Mr. A. Henderson; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *July 15*, 333, 334.
Return, Form of.
Qs. Mr. T. Davies, Mr. C. Money; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 24*, 1583, 1584.

Walrond, Mr. L. [Devon, Tiverton]
Colonial Loans with Imperial Guarantee, *July 17*, 668, 678.

Walton Sir J. L. — *Attorney - General* [Leeds, S.]
Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 1051–1053, 1057, 1058, 1059, 1061, 1062, 1064, 1066.
High Court of Justice, State of Business in, Necessity for Appointment of additional Judge, etc., *July 12*, 199–205.
Post Office Sites Bill, *Com.*, *July 19*, 1034.
Public Trustee, Appointment of, *July 16*, 542, 543; *July 24*, 1585.

War Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane.
Parliamentary Under Secretary—Earl of Portsmouth.
Financial Secretary — Mr. T. R. Buchanan.
Clerical Staffs of certain Departments, Allowances to.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 23*, 1311, 1313.
Clothing Contracts—Allocation of
Irish Firms.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 23*, 1321, 1322.
Scottish Firms.
Qs. Mr. Watt, *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 17*, 679; *July 24*, 1569.
Welsh Firms.
Qs. Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 22*, 1159.

[*cont.*

War Office—*cont.*
Meat Contracts—System of placing.
Q. Mr. H. Heaton; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 18*, 906.

Wason, Mr. J. C. [Orkney and Shetland]
Africa, East
Land Reserves for Natives, *July 17*, 682–684; *July 22*, 1165.
Visit of Under-Secretary, *July 22*, 1166.
Africa, West—Slavery in San Thomé and Principé, *July 22*, 1189.
Balta Sound—Duties of H.M.S. "Hebe," *July 22*, 1181.
Cabs, Horse-drawn, Taximeters for, *July 22*, 1169.
Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *July 16*, 628.
Portugal—Terms of Treaty of August, 1890, *July 12*, 196.

Waste Lands (Ireland) Improvement Bill
c. Intro. & 1R., *July 17*, 710, 711.

Waterlow, Mr. D. S. [Islington, N.]
Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 1478–1482, 1505.
Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1742.

Watt, Mr. H. A. [Glasgow, College]
Admiralty and War Office Clothing Contracts placed with Scottish Firms, *July 17*, 675, 679.
"Alexandra" Upholstery Contract, *July 17*, 680, 681.
Bach, Albert—Case of, *July 16*, 538.
Colonial Governorships—Appointments to, *July 16*, 532.
Finance Bill, *Con.*, *July 16*, 555.
Income-tax — Notices of Assessment, assimilating Procedure as to, in England and Scotland, *July 16*, 555.
Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *July 16*, 626-627.
Navy—Obsolete Vessels, Conditions of selling, *July 16*, 523.
Public Parks in Scotland—Administration of, *July 24*, 1586.
Scottish Appeal System—Revision of, *July 17*, 693.
Scottish Estimates—Discussion of, *July 15*, 304.
Telegraph (Money) Bill, *Con.*, *July 19*, 1028; 3R., *July 22*, 1228.
War Office Clothing Contracts placed with Scottish Firms, *July 24*, 1569.

Wedgwood, Mr. J. C. [Newcastle-under-Lyme]
Temperance—Teaching of, *July 11*, 36.
Youthful Offenders Bill—Facilities for, *July 11*, 36.

Weights and Measures Acts
Regulations, Date of issue of.
Q. Dr. Hazel; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 22*, 1149.

Weir, Mr. J. G. [Ross and Cromarty]
Balintore Harbour—Inspection of, *July 24*, 1563.
Colwyn Bay, Water Supply, *July 22* 1146.
Indian Railways—Memorial as to Bombay-Sind Route, *July 18*, 902.
Lewis, Island of
Lunatics, Accommodation for, *July 22*, 1142.
Sanitary Condition, *July 23*, 1333.
Stornoway Postal Facilities, *July 22*, 1143.
Water Supply, *July 22*, 1142.
Local Government Board Report—Date of Issue, *July 23*, 1330.
Motor Accidents during 1905 and 1906, *July 23*, 1329.
Public Health Act — Defaulting Local Authorities dealt with in 1906, *July 23*, 1331.
Rate Collection—Cost of Legal Proceedings, *July 23*, 1328.
Ross-shire Schools, Water Supply, *July 22*, 1141.
St. Asaph—Sanitary Condition of District, *July 23*, 1331.
Vaccination—Calves hired for Production of Lymph, *July 22*, 1146.

Welshpool
Burial Ground, Decision as to.
Qs. Mr. D. Williams, Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 24*, 1581, 1582.

Wemyss, Earl of
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, 3R., *July 23*, 1285–1287.

West Ham
Page, W., Case of.
Q. Mr. Thorne; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 18*, 919.

West Indies
[*See also* Names of Islands.]
Naval Force.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 11*, 39.
Qs. Sir G. Parker, Mr. H. Cox; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 15*, 313, 314.
Qs. Sir G. Parker, Mr. H. Cox; *As.* Mr. Lambert, *July 23*, 1337, 1338.

Western Australia
Aborigines, Treatment of.
Q. Mr. Alden; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 11*, 43.

Westmoreland
Telephone Service Charges.
Q. Mr. Stewart-Smith; *A.* Capt. Norton, *July 22*, 1176.

Whitbread, Mr. S. H. [Hunts, Huntingdon]
Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.), Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 1495.

White, Mr. J. D. [Dumbartonshire]
Australian Import Duties on British Goods, *July 24*, 1565.
Bass Rock, Valuation of, *July 22*, 1129.
Bell Rock and Dhu Heartach Rock, Sum paid for Use of, *July 16*, 515.
Emigration—Scottish Statistics, *July 22*, 1172, 1312.
High Court of Justice, State of Business in, Necessity for Appointment of Additional Judge, etc., *July 12*, 234.
Old Kilpatrick—Dalmuir Land purchased for New School, *July 22*, 1182.
Vaccination Exemption Certificate Fees, Disposal of, *July 17*, 691.

White, Mr. L. [Yorks, E.R., Buckrose]
Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 1490-1492, 1508.
Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1728, 1735, 1738, 1749, 1750, 1751.

White, Mr. P. [Meath, N.]
Billywood—Case of A. H. Armstrong, *July 16*, 519.
Evictions—Claims of J. Meade and M. Tiernan, *July 12*, 195, 196.

Whitehead, Mr. R. [Essex, S.E.]
General Post Office New Building, *July 15*, 336.
Local Government Board Building Loans, Repayment of, *July 15*, 333.
Marylebone Council School Managers, *July 24*, 1567.
Woolwich—Reinforced Concrete used at, *July 22*, 1137.

Whiteley, Mr. G., *Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury* [Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey]
Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.), Bill, *Com.*, *July 23*, 1524.

Wicklow
New Writ for East Wicklow, *July 17*, 660.

Wiles, Mr. T. [Islington, S.]
Post Office Employees' Grievances—date of Presenting Report, *July 16*, 515.

Williams, Colonel R. [Dorset, W.]
Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1737, 1738.

Williams, Mr. A. O. [Merionethshire]
Welshpool Burial Ground, *July 24*, 1581, 1582.

Willoughby de Eresby, Lord [Lincolnshire, Horncastle]
Finance Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 165, 167.
Income Tax, Deduction for Cost of Insurance and Expenses of Management, *July 11*, 165, 167.

Wilson, Mr. W. T. [Lancashire, S.E., Westhoughton]
Admiralty Contracts — Wages paid by certain Firms, *July 16*, 517.
Bristol Postal Telegraph Delays, *July 17*, 676.
Post Office Contracts and the Fair Wages Clause, *July 22*, 1144.
Postmasters, Sub., Letter Boxes of, *July 18*, 901.
Telegram Counting, New Scheme for, *July 22*, 1145.

Wiltshire
Charities—Return Presented, *July 17*, 662.

Wireless Telegraphy
Radio-telegraphic Convention Report, opportunity for discussing.
Qs. Sir E. Sassoon, Sir G. Parker, Mr. Gwynn; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 11*, 61, 62.
Qs. Sir E. Sassoon, Mr. Forster, Mr. Gwynn, Sir G. Parker; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 18*, 930, 931.

Wisbech Water Bill
c. 3R*, *July 11*, 33.
l. Commons' Amendments, *Con.**, *July 15*, 261.

Wood, Mr. T. M. [Glasgow, St. Rollox]
London County Council (General Powers) Bill, *Con.*, *July 11*, 130.
Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con.*, *July 23*, 1507.

Woolwich Arsenal
Reinforced Concrete used at.
Q. Mr. Whitehead; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 22*, 1137, 1138.
Report of Conference Presented, *July 15*, 262, 301.
Strike, Allegations as to threat of.
Q. Mr. L. Harris; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 15*, 317.

Worcester
Election Petition—Rate levied to meet expenses.
Q. Mr. Snowden; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 16*, 547.

July 11—*July* 24.

Workhouses
Chaplain, Provision of.
Q. Mr. Montgomery; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 22*, 1147.

Workmen's Compensation Act
Aged Workmen, Effect on Employment of.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 18*, 923.
Epileptics, Effect on Employment of.
Qs. Mr. Gulland, Sir J. Randles; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 15*, 327.
Local Authorities, Insurance Powers of.
Q. Mr. E. Gardner; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 18*, 924.

Worthing Gas Bill
l. 3R*, *July 16*, 465.
c. Lords' Amendments, *Con.**, *July 22*, 1125.

Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. S. [Sheffield, Hallam]
Education Policy, *July 11*, 88.
Finance Bill, *Con.*, *July 16*, 568.
Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *July 16*, 624, 625.
Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill, *Con.*, *July 24*, 1723–1728.
Sugar Duty, Reduction of on British and Colonial Sugar, proposed, *July 16*, 568.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G. [Dover]
Death Duties on Landed Estates, allowing Option of Paying Duties in Land, proposed, *July 16*, 588.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 17*, 751; *July 22*, 1240.
Finance Bill, *Con.*, *July 16*, 588.

Yeomanry
Armament of.
Q. Sir S. Scott; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 22*, 1138.
Officers—Shortage in London Regiments.
Q. Mr. T. R. Bethell; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 15*, 307.

York (Micklegate Strays) Bill
c. 2R.* *July 18*, 893.

Yorkshire
(Colne Valley)—New Member Sworn, *July 23*, 1375.

Young, Mr. S. [Cavan, E.]
Hudson Estate, Sale of, *July 18*, 905.

Younger, Mr. G. [Ayr Burghs]
Cavalry for Scotland, *July 15*, 316.
Death Duties on Landed Estates, allowing Option of Paying Duties in Land, proposed, *July 16*, 588.
Finance Bill, *Con.*, *July 16*, 588.

Youthful Offenders Bill
Facilities for.
Q. Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Mr Gladstone, *July 11*, 36.

Yoxall, Mr. J. H. [Nottingham, W.]
Education
Attendance Statistics, *July 11*, 48.
Moral Instruction, Absence of Provision for, *July 11*, 124, 141.
Schools, Air Space in, *July 11*, 142.
Training Colleges, Hostels in connection with—Government Policy as to, *July 11*, 141.
London County Council (General Powers) Bill, *Con.*, *July 11*, 132–134.
Midland Railway Bill, 2R., *July 18*, 989.

Zouche of Haryngworth, Lord
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Rep.* *July 19*, 830.